```
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER 15, 1999 - 1:30 P.M.
 1
 2
                             * * *
 3
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Good afternoon, everyone,
 4 and welcome to the November Board meeting of the
   California Integrated Waste Management Board. As you can
   see by the agenda, it's a roughly two-and-a-half-day Board
 7 meeting.
8
                  Wednesday will be strictly devoted to the
9 Disposal Reporting System, and today, as well as tomorrow,
10 will be devoted to Board business as it relates to action
   items. Wednesday will be a special session of the Board
11
12 as an agenda item for the Disposal Reporting System.
13
                  Madam Secretary, will you please call the
14 roll and establish a quorum.
15
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: Here.
16
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
17
                  BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Here.
18
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
19
20
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Here.
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
21
22
                  Chairman Eaton.
23
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Here.
24
                  Quorum is established.
25
                  Okay, Members. We'll start with
```

- 1 Mr. Pennington. Any ex partes, or if you would like,
- $2\,$ Mr. Pennington, I would be happy to report the few that I
- 3 have to orally include and you can just piggy back, if
- 4 that's okay with you.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Fine. Thank you,
- 6 Mr. Chairman.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right.
- 8 These are all letters -- Andrew Caldwell
- 9 from COLAB regarding Tajiguas Landfill; Linda Caruso, an
- 10 individual, regarding Lionudakis; Scott O'Thompson
- 11 regarding Tajiguas Landfill; Rosalie Skefich, Custom
- 12 Environmental Services, Tajiguas Landfill; Ken Shamordola,
- 13 Tajiguas Landfill; Kelley Shewmaker on Lionudakis; Presley
- 14 Carbajal on Lionudakis; Raed Samara, Lionudakis; Larry
- 15 Dobbs on Lionudakis; Shelagh Caldwell, Lionudakis; and
- 16 Rick Best regarding RPPC.
- Mr. Pennington, any additions?
- 18 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: No, Mr. Chairman.
- 19 I did receive the E-mail from Ken.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ken Shamordola.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: You did very
- 22 well. Thank you. And all the others I'm up to date on.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Larry Dobbs,
- 25 Lionudakis; Shelagh Caldwell, Lionudakis; Ken Shamordola,

- 1 Tajiguas; Gary Catrenga, Total Tire Recycling. I said
- 2 "hi" to Becky Cyren, an old friend from Auburn and saw
- 3 Mike Cooper and John Cupps. That's it. Everything else
- 4 is up to date.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 7 Mr. Chair. I met with Michael Stover, City of Lakewood,
- 8 when I toured the SERRF facility, and also I believe it
- 9 was Charlie Tripp of the City of Long Beach who gave me
- 10 the tour of that facility. Also had a meet-and-greet with
- 11 Ron Shankman, Redding Boe Disposal; Kelley Aster, who is a
- 12 lobbyist for -- I forget the name of their group for
- 13 Southern California Operators; Phil Anthony; also a
- 14 representative from EDCO, and I'm getting that name now
- 15 from -- my assistant is getting that; and Mr. Ron
- 16 Rowenberg from CR&R.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. And I had just
- 18 one additional Mike Cooper, meet-and-greet at the
- 19 beginning of today's meeting, a quick hello.
- 20 Before we conduct any further business for
- 21 the day, I didn't want you to think that the Board was
- 22 remiss, but recently we've suffered a loss here at the
- 23 Board of a very valued member of our staff. We were in
- 24 San Luis Obispo and didn't think it would be appropriate
- 25 since there were none of his friends or coworkers here to

- 1 acknowledge him, but that would have been the loss of Ron
- 2 Weber who many of you even worked with or worked alongside
- 3 and who recently lost his battle with cancer. And I
- 4 wanted to express on behalf of the Board and the Members
- 5 not only our appreciation for his years of work here, but
- 6 our condolences to his family. So for all of us, we're
- 7 going to miss him. I thought it would be appropriate to
- 8 acknowledge him in front of his friends in a place where
- 9 those who were not lucky enough to work with him or get to
- 10 to know him.
- 11 Before we begin, for those of you who may
- 12 be here and realize that we're starting a meeting in the
- 13 afternoon, we remind that you there are speaker request
- 14 forms on the back table. If you wish to address us on any
- 15 matter that will come forward on today's agenda, please
- 16 fill out a slip with the specific item number or numbers
- 17 that you would like to have addressed, and we'll make sure
- 18 we get it to Ms. Dominguez on my left and on your right,
- 19 and she will make sure you speak.
- 20 Members, any reports? Mr. Pennington.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: No, Mr. Chairman,
- 22 I don't believe at this time. Thank you.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just two quick ones.
- 25 First off, just so everybody remembers,

- 1 today is America Recycles Day. Today is -- while the
- 2 event was celebrated on the 9th on the Wastewise downlink
- 3 conferencing, people need to know if they're not buying
- 4 recycled, you're not recycling. You've got to get your
- 5 cities and counties to do what they can.
- 6 Also just a quick report, I was one of the
- 7 speakers at the Southern California Waste Management forum
- 8 in the City of Industry on the new millenium challenges,
- 9 and one of our former colleagues and now Senator, Wesley
- 10 Chesebro, was a keynote speaker talking about this
- 11 organization and his legislation on the plastics issues.
- 12 Pretty good event.
- 13 And then since the Chairman doesn't want to
- 14 accept this, I'll just let people know that -- he wants me
- 15 to accept it. This was presented to us from the
- 16 Sacramento Chapter of Juvenile Diabetes. The efforts of
- 17 this Board, we raised \$3,571 to help fight this. This is
- 18 our third year. Participation has been incredible. This
- 19 obviously belongs to all the employees of the Waste Board
- 20 because this wouldn't happen if it wasn't for their
- 21 efforts. So we'll accept it on behalf of all those who
- 22 participated.
- 23 (Applause)
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,

- 1 Mr. Chairman. As I said, I toured SERRF which was very
- 2 interesting to see the process by which they produced
- 3 energy, and the City of Lakewood took me there and it was
- 4 most interesting and worthwhile.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: I just have two items.
- 6 One is I just returned from Florida where I
- 7 was up to my eyes in alligators literally and
- 8 figuratively, and while I was getting bit by all these
- 9 gnats, I think the best business down there is in
- 10 screening. I don't think they have a recycling problem
- 11 down there, that's for sure. But it was very, very
- 12 interesting and I would like to thank the American
- 13 Plastics Council for their invitation. It was quite a
- 14 lively dialogue and it should be known that ourselves,
- 15 along with the state of Wisconsin and other states, are
- 16 trying to work on a very, very difficult problem. It was
- 17 most informative in terms of what some of the other states
- 18 are trying to do and work with their local conditions, and
- 19 the same with us.
- 20 As is always the case, we always tend to be
- 21 a little bit late on certain things, but today we would
- 22 like to -- I would like to have Mr. Pennington join me out
- 23 in front here where, for those of you who may or may not
- 24 have attended Board meetings over the last several years,
- 25 Patti Bertram was our Board Administrative Assistant and

- 1 she labored long and hard and you never saw a glitch in
- 2 anything. It's really due to Patti's hard work. So
- 3 during her tenure at the Board where she worked for a
- 4 former Board Member, Sam Egigian, and then she tried to
- 5 take on the challenge that a Board Member wasn't
- 6 challenging enough, to take on the challenge of having to
- 7 serve all Board Members in that role and did a very, very
- 8 admirable job.
- 9 So here we are, five years almost to the
- 10 month, I believe, to come and say thank you for her hard
- 11 work and to acknowledge her special efforts here at the
- 12 Board, and before she went on to do the new Special Waste
- 13 Division at the Board, and consistency at that department.
- 14 For that reason, I would like to ask my fellow Board
- 15 Members to indulge. As we have said in the past, we're
- 16 going to acknowledge with a vote on this resolution.
- 17 So if you could take up Item Number 40 in
- 18 the agenda which is acknowledging Patti for her role, and
- 19 if Mr. Pennington will join me down front since during
- 20 that time he served in that capacity many, many things,
- 21 and we'll read the resolution and then we'll be able to
- 22 vote on it.
- 23 Mr. Pennington, would you join me down
- 24 front?
- 25 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Sure.

1

```
2 will do it in sign language is what I understand.
 3
                   (Laughter)
 4
                   CHAIRMAN EATON: That's what we do at
 5
    Democratic conventions, Dan.
 6
                   (Laughter)
 7
                   CHAIRMAN EATON: The resolution states,
    "Whereas, the California Integrated Waste Management Board
 8
    is responsible for working with local governments in the
    solid waste industry to help Californians meet its waste
    diversion mandates and establish markets for recyclable
11
   materials; and, whereas, to accomplish this mission, the
13 Board holds monthly meetings ranging from committee
14
   meetings to full Board hearings; and, whereas, Patricia
15 Bertram has served the Board as the Board's Administrative
16 Assistant for the past five years with responsibility to
    notice all committee and Board hearings and overseeing all
    the organization and organizational plans for its
    meetings, including arrangements of meetings throughout
    our great state of California; and, whereas, during these
21
    five years of service, Ms. Bertram has been responsible
   for noticing 264 committee meetings and nearly 65 monthly
23 Board meetings where," trash, trash, trash, trash, trash,
24 trash -- that's not in the resolution. I just thought I
25 would say it was talked about constantly, and it's trash
```

CHAIRMAN EATON: Patti, I'll read and Dan

- 1 talking and not on a basketball court. "And, whereas, she
- 2 has prepared most of the agenda items during this time for
- 3 all of our nearly 2,000 stakeholders; therefore, be it
- 4 resolved, that the California Integrated Waste Management
- 5 Board, in appreciation for her time of service and
- 6 commitment to the Board, does hereby commend Patricia
- 7 Bertram for her exemplary contributions to the Board and
- 8 wishes her well in the future."
- 9 There's a lot more here in the resolution,
- 10 but I think to sort of ad-lib and say that -- and I'll let
- 11 Dan say a few words as well -- but in my short tenure here
- 12 and when I first came, she was one of the first persons
- 13 that I was introduced to, and any time you had a problem,
- 14 you could track her down. Any time she had a problem, she
- 15 always made it be known to you ahead of time and not after
- 16 the fact. She worked on her own, and when she had a
- 17 question, she came to you.
- 18 Her judgment was impeccable, and we're
- 19 going to miss you in that capacity, but we know in the
- 20 Special Waste Division we're going to need that help, and
- 21 we just thought it would be nice to say thank you to you
- 22 for all your help.
- Thank you.
- 24 (Applause)
- 25 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I can't add much

```
1 to what the Chairman has said other than when I came in, I
 2 had no idea how complicated getting ready for these Board
 3 meetings can be and is, and what a joy it was to have
   Patti there to help us get organized and stay organized.
 5
                  It was a real pleasure working with you,
 6
   and we wish you all the best luck in your new assignment.
 7
                   (Applause)
 8
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'm going to
9 move adoption of Resolution 1999-617.
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll second.
10
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington moves and
11
12 Mr. Jones seconds that we adopt the resolution as it
13 relates to commending Patti Bertram.
14
                  Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
15
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
16
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
17
                  BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
18
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
19
20
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
21
22
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
23
                  Thank you.
```

25 of you who have never been here where I always forget to

Now comes the part of the meeting for those

24

- 1 acknowledge Mr. Chandler and his report.
- 2 (Laughter)
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: I just thought I would
- 4 point that out one more time, and I will acknowledge
- 5 Mr. Chandler. And he's going to report on how the harvest
- 6 went this year and when the walnuts will be available for
- 7 purchase for those -- and whether or not the increase has
- 8 gone up as we're reading on the mercantile charts.
- 9 Mr. Chandler.
- 10 (Laughter)
- MR. CHANDLER: He's in rare form today. We
- 12 should send him to Florida more often.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I wonder what he
- 14 got bit by.
- 15 (Laughter)
- MR. CHANDLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I
- 17 think, and good afternoon.
- I do have just one item that I would like
- 19 to speak to in general and that has to do with our
- 20 biennial reviews. As you know, the Board will be
- 21 considering biennial reviews for the cities of Lakewood
- 22 and Auburn, as well as Placer County and the Inyo Waste
- 23 Management Agency during the meetings today and tomorrow;
- 24 and once completed, this Board will have completed the
- 25 reviews of 459 of the 464 reporting jurisdictions around

- 1 the state except for three jurisdictions that are
- 2 scheduled to be reviewed later. Next month's agenda will
- 3 complete the reviews for the 1995 and 1996 annual reports.
- 4 To date, the Board has approved 331
- 5 jurisdictions for fully meeting the AB 939 requirements
- 6 and approved an additional 61 on the basis of good faith
- 7 efforts. The Board has also put 63 jurisdictions to date
- 8 on compliance orders, which as you know are intended to
- 9 help these communities comply with their waste diversion
- 10 requirements. This review effort has been lengthy but
- 11 rewarding.
- The Board staff is directly working with
- 13 more than 50 cities and counties throughout the state in
- 14 identifying and implementing programs to move them towards
- 15 the 50-percent mandate, and many jurisdictions are
- 16 conducting new base year studies to get an accurate
- 17 measure of where they are, and more importantly, where
- 18 they need to focus their efforts as they work towards the
- 19 50-percent goal. The review effort has shown that about
- 20 70 jurisdictions have already reached or exceeded the 50
- 21 percent by 1996, which bodes well for the year 2000; and
- 22 as new and improved programs stemming from the Board's
- 23 assistance and compliance orders continue to be brought on
- 24 line, staff expects significant diversion increases around
- 25 the state.

```
On Wednesday, the day-long disposal
 1
    reporting workshop will allow for a comprehensive and
 2
    constructive discussion on the Disposal Reporting System.
    The workshop is designed to identify problems related to
 5
    the system and its implementation, but more importantly to
    share solutions.
 7
                   Then at the December 14th and 15th Board
    meeting, staff will present for your information a
    strategy and schedule for implementing SB 1066. As you
    recall, SB 1066, which was enacted in 1997, authorizes the
    Board to grant one or more single- or multiple-year time
11
    extensions from the diversion requirements and alternative
    diversion requirements under specified circumstances.
14
                   Staff will be suggesting, among other
    things, an intensive effort to seek input from
    jurisdictions throughout the state by conducting workshops
    in the months of January and February. These workshops
    will allow staff and the jurisdictions to arrive at mutual
18
    understandings of the type necessary to support the SB
19
   1066 request.
20
21
                   Although as Chairman Eaton has said, the
   low hanging fruit has been plucked in terms of recycling
23 and waste diversion and we know the toughest part of the
```

24 job still lies ahead, we continue to believe that the

25 majority of California cities and counties will reach or

- 1 come very close to cutting their trash in half by the end
- 2 of next year. When you consider where we started from a
- 3 decade ago, that's a significant accomplishment indeed.
- 4 That concludes my remarks. Thank you.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you, Mr. Chandler.
- 6 Any questions, comments? All right.
- 7 Just a couple of housekeeping matters
- ${\tt 8}\,$ because there have been a number of changes to the agenda
- 9 given last Thursday's holiday and some recent requests and
- 10 adjustments.
- 11 Item E, which was the Lionudakis Wood and
- 12 Green Waste Recycling Compost Facility permit, has been
- 13 pulled at the request of the operator and the LEA due to
- 14 some continuing negotiations and concerns raised by the
- 15 various parties. That item, as I understand it, was
- 16 continued until December at which time we will take up the
- 17 Lionudakis item.
- 18 In addition, today, one of the reasons for
- 19 the Monday afternoon session was that we were going to
- 20 hear Item Number 38, which was the AB 59 appeal of
- 21 Safety-Kleen, again for reasons between the parties, that
- 22 item was asked to be removed from today's agenda and will
- 23 be set in the near future. It will not be continued to
- 24 next month, it will be set at a separate meeting.
- 25 So if any of you are here for those items,

- 1 I apologize, but the parties felt they needed more time.
- In addition, as a courtesy to Senator
- 3 Roberti, who is unable to be here today, the item
- 4 concerning the City of Lakewood, which is a continued item
- 5 and should be heard first up today, will be heard first
- 6 thing tomorrow morning, as well as Item 14 which involves
- 7 a Downey facility. Senator Roberti would like to be
- 8 present at both of those, so therefore, they will not be
- 9 heard in the regular course of business which would have
- 10 been today.
- 11 In addition, Items Number 29 and 30, which
- 12 was Clean-Up and Abatement Order and Major Tire Facility
- 13 Permits for MELP, has been consolidated into a different
- 14 item, so those items will be incorporated into item -- and
- 15 I'm just trying to read.
- MR. CHANDLER: 31.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: 31. So in other words,
- 18 there will be no Item 29 or 30 on today's, tomorrow's or
- 19 Wednesday's agenda.
- 20 Members, we will also have two closed
- 21 sessions is my understanding, one tomorrow shortly before
- 22 lunch and one perhaps on Wednesday dealing with some
- 23 litigation and personnel matters. So if you could just
- 24 set that time aside, I think we'll break them up into two
- 25 sessions. That way we'll be able to take a lunch break

```
1 and get back to the regular long agenda as well.
```

- 2 Before I read the consent calendar,
- 3 Members, are there any items that you would like to have
- 4 pulled from consent calendar? Let me read which items I
- 5 have for the consent calendar. Items Number 6, 7, 8, 9,
- 6 10, 11, 28, 34 and 36.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman,
- 8 I'll move adoption of the consent calendar.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll second.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington moves and
- 12 Mr. Jones seconds that we adopt the consent calendar
- 13 consisting of Items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 28, 34 and 36.
- 14 Madam Secretary, would you please call the
- 15 roll.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 20 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 22 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- Okay. Consent calendar is adopted. All
- 25 right.

```
1
                   I will also, because of the moving around
   of several items and the time allotments that we were
    having to set aside for the Safety-Kleen appeal, which
    were substantial but now are not needed, we will be moving
    around, contrary to what we normally do here at the Board,
    for different items. And so it will not be in numerical
 7
    sequence, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9, but rather we'll
    jump around and take up the Waste Prevention and Market
    Development items under new business after we do continued
    items, and I'll read through those as we get to that
    segment just so that we can have those items heard.
11
12
                   If there are any members of the audience --
    and I understand there may be a few -- that for any reason
14
    have traveled to the Board meeting to hear either the
    previous items, whether they be the Downey item, Lakewood
    item or any of the other items that may be moved to
16
    Tuesday's agenda, we will be happy to take your testimony.
    You can just let us know that you will not able to return
18
    when those items will be heard in the regular course of
   business in the next couple days and we'll be sure that
21
    you get on today's agenda to have your testimony on the
    record for the benefit not only of us Members, but for the
23
   public as well.
24
                   So with that, continued -- first order of
25 business, continued business agenda items, consideration
```

- 1 of a new Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Santa Maria
- 2 Transfer Station.
- 3 Ms. Nauman.
- 4 MS. NAUMAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
- 5 and Members. Julie Nauman, Deputy Director Permitting and
- 6 Enforcement Division. In the interest of time, I will
- 7 just turn it over to staff for the presentation.
- 8 MS. KIGER: Good afternoon, Chairman Eaton
- 9 and Board Members. I'm Jenifer Kiger with the Permitting
- 10 and Inspection Branch.
- 11 Item A regards consideration of the new
- 12 Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Santa Maria Transfer
- 13 Station in San Luis Obispo County. The proposed facility
- 14 will be owned by the Troesh family trust and operated by
- 15 Santa Maria Transfer, Incorporated.
- The proposed permit is for the operation of
- 17 a new large volume transfer processing facility to be
- 18 located on 3.28 acres. The proposed facility will be
- 19 built in two phases.
- 20 Phase one will consist of a 7,800 square
- 21 foot building. The building will house office space, a
- 22 drop-off recycling center, a maintenance shop, and storage
- 23 and the operation for the unloading, storage, and transfer
- 24 of mixed solid waste. Phase two will include a 6,300
- 25 square foot addition to the transfer building following

- 1 the closure of Santa Maria Landfill.
- 2 Material recovery will be limited to large
- 3 salvageable material such as concrete and asphalt, white
- 4 goods, wood, and cardboard that would be sorted manually.
- 5 The facility will serve the cities of Santa Maria and
- 6 Guadalupe, and the unincorporated areas of northern Santa
- 7 Barbara County and southern San Luis Obispo County.
- 8 The proposed permit will include both Phase
- 9 1 and Phase 2 of the transfer station, and it is
- 10 anticipated that Phase 1 operations will handle an average
- 11 daily throughput of 29 tons per day, increasing to 84 tons
- 12 per day within five years. After Phase 2 is constructed,
- 13 the facility will be able to handle a maximum daily
- 14 throughput of 500 tons per day.
- 15 Staff reviewed the proposed permit and
- 16 supporting documentation and have found that it meets all
- 17 the requirements on page 3 of this item and acceptable for
- 18 consideration by the Board.
- 19 First, the Santa Maria transfer station is
- 20 identified and described in the unincorporated county
- 21 nondisposal facility element of the San Luis Obispo County
- 22 CIWMP. Therefore, the facility is in conformance with PRC
- 23 50001. Second, the proposed transfer station has not yet
- 24 been constructed. Therefore, inspection of the facility's
- 25 operation for consistency of state minimum standards is

```
1 not applicable at this time. Compliance with California
```

- 2 Environmental Quality Act, CEQA, has been completed.
- In conclusion, staff recommend that the
- 4 Board adopt Resolution Number 1999-574, concurring in the
- 5 issuance of Solid Waste Facility Permit Number 40-AA-0022.
- 6 Mr. Michael McGee representing the Local
- 7 Enforcement Agency and Mr. Michael Hoover representing the
- 8 operator are present to answer any questions you may have.
- 9 This concludes staff's presentation.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of staff or
- 11 the operator or the LEA?
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I would like to move
- 15 adoption of Resolution 1999-574 for the consideration of a
- 16 Solid Waste Facility Permit of the Santa Maria Transfer
- 17 Station, San Luis Obispo County.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Second.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones moves and
- 21 Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt Resolution
- 22 1999-574.
- 23 Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- 24 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.

- 1 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 5 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- 7 Okay. Item Number C, consideration of
- 8 staff recommendation on the biennial review findings for
- 9 the Source Reduction and Recycling Element for Inyo
- 10 Regional Waste Management Agency.
- MR. SCHIAVO: Good afternoon. Pat Schiavo
- 12 of the Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Division,
- 13 and I'll turn this presentation over to Keir Furey.
- MR. FUREY: Good afternoon, Chairman
- 15 Eaton, Board Members. I'm Kier Furey with the Office of
- 16 Local Assistance, Central Section.
- 17 Item C has been carried over from the
- 18 October 20th Board meeting. It is the consideration of a
- 19 biennial review and the consideration of a compliance
- 20 order relative to the biennial review for the Inyo
- 21 Regional Waste Management Agency.
- 22 At the October 20th Board meeting, the
- 23 Board directed staff to work with Inyo Regional Waste
- 24 Management Agency to complete their diversion
- 25 recalculations for 1995 and 1996. Staff worked with the

```
1 consultant representing the Inyo Regional Waste Management
```

- 2 Agency, and together we have constructed a mutually
- 3 agreeable solution. Revised Board of Equalization data
- 4 has been used to correct their 1995 and 1996 reporting
- 5 year disposal tonnages. These corrected reporting year
- 6 tonnages will give the Inyo Regional Waste Management
- 7 Agency a diversion of 30 percent for 1995 and 27 percent
- 8 for 1996.
- 9 Staff recommends approval of the biennial
- 10 review. A representative for the Regional Agency is in
- 11 attendance today and available for questions.
- 12 That concludes my presentation.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of staff?
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'll move the
- 17 adoption of Resolution 1999-525.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Second.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington moves and
- $20\,$ Mr. Jones seconds that we adopt Resolution 1999-515 as
- 21 revised, if I'm not mistaken. It's in my binder.
- 22 Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 25 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.

1

24

```
BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
 2
 3
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
 4
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
 5
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
 6
                  All right. Moving into new business
 7
   agenda items, we'll take up the Waste Prevention and
   Market Development section. Members, I'm going to read
   off the numbers that because of the switching around of
   numerous items and deletion of numerous items due to
11 parties' stipulations, et cetera, we're going to in Waste
12 Prevention and Market Development hear Items 18, 19, 24,
   25, 26, 27, I believe in that order. And so that would be
14
   six items, one being on consent, the other one having been
   dispensed with.
15
                  Ms. Trgovcich, welcome.
16
17
                  MS. TRGOVCICH: Good afternoon, Chairman
   Eaton and Members. I'm Caren Trgovcich, Deputy Director
18
   of the Waste Prevention and Market Development Division.
19
20
                  The first item is consideration of approval
21
   of the Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program
   application for VP Incorporated, dba Valley Pallet. This
23
   item will be presented by Jeff Ingalls.
```

By way of introduction, I would just like

25 to point out for the Board that if this loan is approved

BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.

- 1 today, that will bring the number of loans approved by the
- 2 Board to date to 83 totaling \$41.1 million out of the
- 3 sub-account.
- 4 Jeff.
- 5 MR. INGALLS: Thank you, Caren. Good
- 6 morning or afternoon, Chairman Eaton and Board Members.
- 7 My name is Jeff Ingalls. I'm a loan
- 8 officer with the Recycling Market Development Zone
- 9 program. Happy to present Item Number 567, consideration
- 10 and approval of the Recycling Market Development Revolving
- 11 Loan Program application for VP Incorporated, doing
- 12 business as Valley Pallet. VP Incorporated has requested
- 13 a \$375,000 loan to finance commercial real estate,
- 14 machinery and equipment and to remanufacture wood pallets.
- This project is eligible as a reuse project
- 16 in manufacturing wooden pallets from other dismantled
- 17 broken pallets, and the feedstock is post-consumer waste
- 18 which comes from companies that would use wood pallets to
- 19 ship their products to the end users.
- The loan committee met on November 4th,
- 21 1999 and approved the loan with one condition. The loan
- 22 committee requested either a Phase 1 Environmental Report
- 23 or a Vista Transaction Screen Report, if the results were
- 24 satisfactory to the Board. This report has been ordered
- 25 and we're waiting for that report.

```
1
                   Permitting and Enforcement have also
 2 reviewed this project and determined that no permits are
   required. The Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance
    Division also reviewed this process and this project, and
    there's no -- any wooden pallets are normally disposed of
    in landfills in Kings County.
 7
                   The original item in the agenda item states
   that the projected tonnage increase was to be 25,000 tons
   per year. The applicant had reevaluated that and
10 determined that it would be 15,000 increased production or
   increased tons per year for this project.
11
12
                   If this item is approved today, this will
13 be the first RMDZ loan for the greater south San Joaquin
14 Valley zone.
15
                  In conclusion, staff recommends that the
16 Board approve the loan contained in Resolution 1999-567 to
17
   VP Incorporated doing business as Valley Pallet in the
    amount of $375,000.
18
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions?
19
20
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
21
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
22
                   BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'll move
    adoption of Resolution 199-567 to approve the loan in the
23
    amount of $375,000 for VP Incorporated, dba Valley Pallet.
```

BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

25

1

25

```
CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Mr. Pennington
 2 moves and Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt
 3 Resolution 1999-567, the loan program application for VP
   Incorporated doing business as Valley Pallet.
 5
                  Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
 6
 7
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
 8
 9
                  BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
10
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
11
12
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
13
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
                  Okay. Item Number 19, consideration and
14
   approval of the revised 1997 and preliminary 1998
16 post-consumer paper recovery rate calculation.
                  MS. TRGOVCICH: Good afternoon, Chairman
17
18 Eaton and Members. This item will be presented by the
19 Waste Prevention and Market Development Division. John
20 Blue will be presenting.
21
                  Just by way of introduction, this is a
22 voluntary rate that the Board established several years
23 ago as a way of tracking progress within the paper
24 industry.
```

John.

```
1 MR. BLUE: Good afternoon, Members of the
```

- 2 Board, Chairman Eaton. I'm John Blue with the Waste
- 3 Prevention and Market Development Division. Unfortunately
- 4 I had a nice slide presentation for you this morning, but
- 5 our laptop won't stay on. I'll be resorting to hand
- 6 waving and page flipping here.
- 7 The post-consumer paper recovery rate for
- 8 California is a comparison of California post-consumer
- 9 paper recovery for beneficial end use versus post-consumer
- 10 paper generation. And in 1993, the Board developed a
- 11 process to monitor progress in developing markets for
- 12 recovered paper and asked staff to report back annually on
- 13 how we're doing.
- In brief, the rate for 1998, the
- 15 preliminary recovery rate was 30.1 percent for all
- 16 paper -- and pardon me while I buzz through the document
- 17 and try to find it. Staff revised the 1997 recovery rate
- 18 down to 30.62. This is -- as you can see, the rate is
- 19 pretty much the same as it was last year, predominantly
- 20 due to weak Asian markets. The Asian economic crisis
- 21 continued through 1998, and California, being extremely
- 22 dependent on the Asian export market for post-consumer
- 23 paper recovery, that affected strongly kind of dampening
- 24 overall California's recovery rate.
- 25 What we're looking for for 1999, in case

- 1 anyone is curious, should be much better. Right now we're
- 2 seeing a tremendous growth in paper prices. We're seeing
- 3 growth in export to Asia, and staff are expecting a
- 4 significant improvement for this figure for 1999.
- 5 Being brief here, staff recommendation
- 6 is -- staff recommends the Board approve staff's
- 7 calculation of the preliminary 1998 post-consumer paper
- 8 recovery rate and the revised 1997 recovery rate. If
- 9 there are any questions, I would be happy to answer them
- 10 at this time.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of Mr. Blue?
- 12 Those rates being for '97 revised was 45.9 and in '98,
- 13 46.9?
- MR. BLUE: Yeah. Revised -- okay. You're
- 15 going to make me be specific here. For 1998, we found
- 16 31.1 for all paper, 45 -- sorry. Again, this was very
- 17 nice in my slide show. 46.92 for old newsprint and 50.9
- 18 percent or 51 percent for old corrugated containers.
- 19 That's for 1998. And '97, the revised recovery rates were
- 20 30.6 percent for all paper, 46 percent for old newsprint,
- 21 and 50.6 percent for old corrugated containers.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Thank you,
- 23 Mr. Blue. So in essence it was just short by a small
- 24 amount of percentage points due to the market stuff and
- 25 you figure that will come back up?

- 1 MR. BLUE: We're anticipating significant
- 2 growth in 1999.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Members.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll make the motion
- 7 to adopt Resolution 1999-564 for consideration and
- 8 approval of the revised '97 and preliminary '98 California
- 9 post-consumer paper recovery rate calculation.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: And I'll second that
- 11 motion.
- 12 Mr. Jones moves and Mr. Eaton seconds that
- 13 we adopt Resolution 1999-564.
- 14 Members, without objection, substitute the
- 15 previous roll call. Hearing no objection, so shall be the
- 16 order.
- 17 Item Number 24, consideration of Rigid
- 18 Plastic Packaging Container compliance agreements for
- 19 compliance year 2000.
- 20 MS. TRGOVCICH: Good afternoon, Chairman
- 21 Eaton, again.
- The next four items are all items dealing
- 23 with the Rigid Plastic Packaging Container Program. What
- 24 we will be doing in order for you is Item 24 will be
- 25 consideration and approval of compliance agreements which

- 1 we briefly overviewed at the last meeting in October where
- 2 several compliance agreements for other product
- 3 manufacturers were approved.
- 4 Item Number 25 will provide a brief
- 5 background discussion on how the 1996 certification
- 6 process went as a prelude to Item Number 26 where you will
- 7 consider what you would like to do with respect to the
- 8 calculation of the 1997 rate and that meeting of the rate
- 9 falling below 25 percent.
- 10 Item number 27 is listed as a
- 11 reconsideration item. We will be providing you with a
- 12 status at the end of these if the Board scheduled for
- 13 public hearing at that time.
- 14 Michelle Marlowe will be presenting Item
- 15 24.
- MS. MARLOWE: Good afternoon, Chairman
- 17 Eaton and Members of the Board. I'm here today with
- 18 Agenda Item Number 24 in which I would like to recommend
- 19 approval of entering into a compliance agreement with
- 20 Masterchem Industries and Loctite Corporation. These
- 21 compliance agreements were our boiler plate -- very, very
- 22 similar to the ones that you approved last month for four
- 23 companies.
- I would just like to make you aware that
- 25 Masterchem has only four products that they sell in

- 1 California. Two of them were in compliance in the year
- 2 1996, and they will be working on bringing the other two
- 3 product lines into compliance through the use of
- 4 post-consumer content in those containers by the end of
- 5 the year 2000.
- 6 With regards to Loctite, they make
- 7 adhesives and sealants and have, I think, six or eight
- 8 products that they sell in California. And I'd like to
- 9 recommend entering into a compliance agreement with that
- 10 corporation as well.
- 11 MS. TRGOVCICH: I'd like to point out for
- 12 your information that with respect to Masterchem, that
- 13 they, along with all the other product manufacturers that
- 14 came before you last month, have approved of the
- 15 compliance agreement that is before you today.
- 16 With respect to Loctite, they have
- 17 submitted some additional language which would eliminate
- 18 the provisions that you added at your last Board meeting
- 19 such as the penalty provisions going back for the
- 20 preceding calendar years, '96, '97, '98, et cetera. They
- 21 have proposed that language. We are bringing before you a
- 22 compliance agreement that does not include their changes.
- 23 Simultaneously, we are noticing them for
- 24 public hearing at the Board's December Board meeting so
- 25 that in the event that they do not proceed to negotiate

- 1 and agree to the compliance agreement as is laid out
- 2 today, they will have the option in December of coming to
- 3 you to revise the agreement potentially or to proceed to
- 4 public hearing.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: What was their basis of
- 6 their objection? I assume they're not here, otherwise I
- 7 would have had speaker slips.
- 8 MS. TRGOVCICH: They have -- in our last --
- 9 Deborah Borzelleri, legal counsel, can speak to this, but
- 10 primarily they are asking for provisions to be removed
- 11 from the agreement which would speak to their liability as
- 12 a product manufacturer. They wanted to eliminate
- 13 reference that they had violated the law, and they wanted
- 14 to remove the wording that would allow the Board, in the
- 15 event of noncompliance with the agreement, to assess civil
- 16 penalties for the intervening years.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. All right.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll move adoption of
- 21 Resolution 1999-582, consideration of approval of a Rigid
- 22 Plastic Packaging Container compliance agreement for the
- 23 year 2000 with Loctite Corporation.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: I'll second that motion.
- 25 Mr. Jones moves and Mr. Eaton seconds that

- 1 we adopt Resolution 1999-582.
- 2 Without objection, we'll substitute the
- 3 previous roll call. Hearing no objection, so shall be
- 4 ordered. All right.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I would like to move
- 8 adoption of Resolution 1999-583, consideration of approval
- 9 of a Rigid Plastic Packaging Container compliance
- 10 agreement for the year 2000 with Masterchem Industries,
- 11 Incorporated.
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: And I'll second.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Second.
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones moves and
- 15 Mr. Pennington seconds that we adopt Resolution 1999-583.
- 16 Without objection, substitute the previous
- 17 roll call. Hearing no objection, so shall be ordered.
- 18 Item Number 25, which is the discussion of
- 19 the 1996 Rigid Plastic Packaging Container certification
- 20 process.
- 21 Before we begin, Members, just to kind of
- 22 refresh your recollection, this is kind of an item that
- 23 was brought forward, kind of a mini review of some of the
- 24 strengths and weaknesses that we encountered and hurdles
- 25 we've had to overcome when we began to take the process.

- 1 It's meant to give us a background and an overview and an
- 2 opportunity to hear from not only the staff who worked
- 3 very, very hard going down an uncharted road -- and the
- 4 road had many curves and ruts and in many cases, dead
- 5 ends, but I think they did a good job -- also the industry
- 6 themselves that had some concerns as to how the process
- 7 would work, some of the advocates also. So it gives us an
- 8 opportunity to get a good, fresh look at where we've been
- 9 before we begin to go where we're going.
- 10 And so with that, I'll turn it over to
- 11 Ms. Trgovcich. Thank you.
- MS. TRGOVCICH: Thank you very much,
- 13 Chairman Eaton.
- 14 As a discussion item, what we wanted to do
- 15 today was simply bring before you in an informal fashion
- 16 an identification of those issues that were raised by
- 17 staff and by interested parties as it relates to how this
- 18 certification process proceeded.
- 19 What I have provided on the back table and
- 20 have handed out to each of you is a two-page summary,
- 21 front and back. The first three pages simply list the
- 22 major themes that we heard in our meetings with interested
- 23 parties and that we have chosen to raise to you. And what
- 24 the back page represents, if you flip it over, it simply
- 25 provides you with a background of the certification

- 1 program and how it proceeded, and that's just by way of
- 2 information for you.
- 3 As you're aware, and we've repeated this
- 4 many times as you've been hearing so many of these items
- 5 recently, at the Board's direction we proceeded to
- 6 initiate a certification program for calendar year 1996
- 7 where we randomly selected 500 product manufacturers to
- 8 receive certification forms. This item is not about the
- 9 results of that process, but more what were some of the
- 10 major issues that came up in that process as we went
- 11 through the random selection and subsequent certification
- 12 process.
- 13 I will draw your attention to Item Number
- 14 1, which is identification of potentially affected product
- 15 manufacturers. When we first initiated this discussion,
- 16 several years ago now, we were unclear as to the number of
- 17 product manufacturers that were potentially affected by
- 18 this law. We had heard figures by industry, by other
- 19 agencies, that it could be anywhere from several hundred
- 20 to tens of thousands of product manufacturers. Many of
- 21 these are located in California. However, many, many more
- 22 are located outside of the state because remember, it's
- 23 manufacturers who offer for sale or sell in California.
- 24 So we have products that are coming in from all over the
- 25 world here.

```
1
                   The certification program that was
   initiated focused on a random selection. Thus we went to
    the Standard Industrial Classification codes, we went to
    trade publications, we went to various web sites, we even
    went shopping ourselves and looked at product manufacturer
    labels in the supermarkets and other stores to determine
 7
    which manufacturers could potentially be placed on a list
    from which a random certification would then follow.
 9
                   This resulted in a mailing that went out,
10
    and what we can say is that as a result of that
    certification process, many, many of those companies were
11
    not regulated under this law; and because statute does not
    require product manufacturers, if they are not regulated,
    to respond to our certification process, in order to close
14
    the books on these unregulated product manufacturers, we
   had to spend a great deal of time with follow-up letters,
    both certified as well as regular mail letters, with phone
    calls, telephone conferences, faxes, E-mails, and it was a
   tremendous records management issue for us internally to
   be able to close the loop on all 500. I think staff has
21
    done an outstanding job over the past several months in
    bringing forward to you those numbers and how this was
23 closed out.
                   So with respect to the identification of
24
25 product manufacturers, if the Board were to undertake a
```

```
1 subsequent certification process for future compliance
```

- 2 years, we would recommend that that certification process
- 3 target specific industry sectors that are likely to be
- 4 regulated. We've identified those SIC codes and we have
- 5 been able to prioritize them with respect to the knowledge
- 6 that we now have based upon the '96 process.
- 7 They are sectors such as hardware, hobbies
- 8 and crafts, and automotive, which would appear to be high
- 9 on the list for certification, and so we would recommend a
- 10 targeted effort at one to two to three of those
- 11 classifications or categories of industries with a
- 12 certification program that runs across all product
- 13 manufacturers listed in that category in the future.
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: So for 3M, what category
- 15 out of the three would you recommend that show up under?
- 16 Hobbies? Crafts?
- MS. TRGOVCICH: It's likely 3M would have
- 18 shown up under several of the categories, that they would
- 19 have been listed under multiple Standard Industrial
- 20 Classification codes. I have a listing here and there are
- 21 many -- I have a listing of over 47, close to 50
- 22 categories, and they could have probably been listed in
- 23 anywhere from three to five of those categories.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you.
- 25 MS. TRGOVCICH: Moving on to the next

- 1 issue, "development of notification letter and
- 2 certification form." We initiated a collaborative effort
- 3 since 1996 was the first year that the Board had ever
- 4 undertaken a certification process, and we met with
- 5 interested parties which included regulated product
- 6 manufacturers, it included trade associations,
- 7 environmental organizations, and we also contacted several
- 8 key legislative offices as well, and developed a
- 9 certification form for both product manufacturers as well
- 10 as container manufacturers. It was agreed at the time
- 11 that it would not be necessary to include the total number
- 12 of containers by product line in the certification forms.
- 13 There was a concern raised on the part of
- 14 product manufacturers, as well as their trade
- 15 associations, that by identifying a specific product line
- 16 by container type and then including the number of
- 17 containers associated with it, that this could potentially
- 18 result in a release of information that could be used for
- 19 competitive purposes.
- 20 This created an issue as we evaluated the
- 21 '96 certifications, especially as it related to those
- $22\,\,$ product manufacturers that pursued the corporate average
- 23 methodology for calculation of the percentage of
- 24 post-consumer resin incorporated into their regular
- 25 containers. When a product manufacturer used the

- 1 corporate averaging methodology and the number of
- 2 containers by product line are not included, it was next
- 3 to impossible for our staff to be able to evaluate and
- 4 therefore verify the corporate averaging claim.
- 5 So what the staff proposal here is -- and
- 6 once again this is not a consideration item, but for your
- 7 information for future items -- that if a future
- 8 certification process is undertaken, that the
- 9 certification form be specifically amended to include the
- 10 number of containers by product line.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: When we had -- when I
- 14 had my briefing, when we talked about this, didn't we say
- 15 that could be handled or was it an idea that it could be
- 16 handled? Because the industry is afraid of giving away
- 17 information that obviously is important to their
- 18 businesses, that if they were going to do corporate
- 19 averaging, then they would supply the information needed
- 20 to be able to verify the number as opposed to a, you know,
- 21 lock-down of numbers.
- 22 It would seem to me that if they could
- 23 verify their corporate averaging, that would take care of
- 24 your need without putting out proprietary information into
- 25 the public forum.

- 1 MS. TRGOVCICH: That would certainly be an
- 2 option to pursue. We included -- in this case, the staff
- 3 recommendation to include the number of containers on the
- 4 certification form because it would eliminate the step of
- 5 going back to that product manufacturer and asking them to
- 6 then verify the corporate averaging claim, but that is
- 7 certainly an option you may pursue.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: But if the form,
- 9 instead of calling for the numbers, said if you are going
- 10 to do corporate averaging and this is what it looks like,
- 11 you need to include the information to verify corporate
- 12 averaging, wouldn't that eliminate the step?
- MS. TRGOVCICH: That certainly would
- 14 eliminate it if it goes on the form, that if you use that
- 15 approach, submit the data to verify it.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Because you're going
- 17 to have people that are going to be -- because of the form
- 18 are going to be putting numbers in that I'm sure if their
- 19 bosses knew were going on a form, could make some people
- 20 real nervous, then maybe being able to put it out to
- 21 verify whatever their determination is would give them a
- 22 sense of comfort.
- MS. TRGOVCICH: Moving on to the next
- 24 issue, Item Number 3. Item Number 3 is phrased "time
- 25 limit for response." What we encountered in the 1996

- 1 certification process was a significant extension of the
- 2 time frame for response beyond the initial 60-day deadline
- 3 specified in this certified mail that was delivered to
- 4 each product manufacturer. So for each of the 500
- 5 randomly selected product manufacturers, when they
- 6 received the initial mailing, they had 60 days from
- 7 receipt to return the information to us.
- 8 What we encountered for '96, because it was
- 9 our first year in proceeding with a cycle like this, was
- 10 that we continued to get requests for extensions or we had
- 11 no responses, and we continued to work with these
- 12 companies, sending out subsequent mailings, making up
- 13 follow-up phone calls, attempting to contact via E-mail or
- 14 any other method. And what we would propose for any
- 15 future certification cycle is that the time frame is
- 16 specified in the initial mailing requiring the product
- 17 manufacturers certification forms or container
- 18 manufacturers certification forms be a specific and final
- 19 deadline.
- There is an option for a single extension
- 21 within the regulation, and that extension could be
- 22 accounted for, but that once that extension deadline was
- 23 up, we would no longer proceed to contact, to mail, to
- 24 follow-up via E-mail or any other method, and we would
- 25 report to the Board the status of all those product

- 1 manufacturers and they would be deemed, at that point in
- 2 time, out of compliance. So that would be the staff
- 3 proposal in the event that you choose to pursue a future
- 4 certification process.
- 5 For 1996, we have been working for almost a
- 6 year and a half right now to resolve the final of the 500
- 7 product manufacturers that received certification forms.
- 8 So we are requesting that there be a cut-off deadline.
- 9 The next issue is record keeping
- 10 requirements, and this gets to the proprietary issue that
- 11 Member Jones just raised and a very important issue to the
- 12 industry. As you are aware, during the last cycle, the
- 13 industry requested that because of the potential
- 14 competitive use of the information submitted as a result
- 15 of this certification process, that a third party
- 16 independent contractor be retained to receive, enter and
- 17 maintain the data; that they would have the expertise to
- 18 be able to identify potential proprietary issues and that
- 19 they would then be able to retain it in a confidential
- 20 format.
- 21 What we encountered during this
- 22 certification process were several things with respect to
- 23 the nature of the information. One was that even though
- 24 this was a very significant issue raised by industry, we
- 25 received many, many product certification forms and

- 1 container manufacturer certification forms here at the
- 2 Board's office as opposed to them being directed to
- 3 Price-Waterhouse. We were very clear on the certification
- 4 forms and cover letters that Price-Waterhouse was being
- 5 retained to maintain confidentiality of this information,
- 6 but many of these manufacturers chose to submit their
- 7 information to us directly.
- 8 The contractor, through no fault of their
- 9 own, had a lack of familiarity with the manufacturers, and
- 10 this resulted in many entities being inadvertently placed
- 11 into an incorrect corporate entity file or being placed
- 12 under a separate product manufacturer for which they had
- 13 no relationship with.
- 14 We also found that certification forms
- 15 could not be readily connected to a product manufacturer
- 16 for compliance purposes, and we believe that this was
- 17 simply a result of a lack of familiarity of a contractor
- 18 or any outside contractor with these entities, especially
- 19 as we were in an age of mergers and acquisitions, that
- 20 many times events will transpire where we can no longer
- 21 track one name from one file to another.
- 22 Finally, as we pursued an enforcement
- 23 process at the Board's direction, it was very difficult
- 24 for us to be able to evaluate a manufacturer's compliance
- 25 when the data was being managed and maintained off site.

- 1 It resulted in a large number of trips being made by staff
- 2 to the office headquarters of the contractor in this
- 3 instance.
- 4 So what we are proposing in the event of a
- 5 future certification process is that both the entry and
- 6 maintenance of the data from product manufacturers and
- 7 container manufacturers be housed here at the Board and
- 8 performed by Board staff.
- 9 I would like to briefly address the
- 10 confidentiality issue. Both statute as well as
- 11 regulations contain a provision that specifies that
- 12 product manufacturers may claim information submitted as
- 13 proprietary to be excluded from availability to the
- 14 general public, and there is that same provision in the
- 15 regulation. So we believe that with the development of a
- 16 secure data system that we would be able to protect the
- 17 confidentiality of this data, similar to that of an
- 18 outside contractor.
- 19 Finally, the last issue was not an issue
- 20 that was a part of this certification process but rather
- 21 we are raising simply for your consideration in a future
- 22 certification process, and that is the audit requirements.
- 23 There are audit provisions allowed for both in statute as
- 24 well as regulation. The regulatory audit provisions are
- 25 provisions pertaining to follow-up information that the

- 1 Board can request the manner in which that information is
- 2 compiled and then submitted to the Board.
- 3 Statute contains a broader audit provision.
- 4 And what we are recommending, since many of the
- 5 certifications received are from corporate entities who
- 6 are very complex in nature, who have many, many product
- 7 lines, and for which it may be very difficult to be able
- 8 to track the methodologies and information used to support
- 9 the option and compliance claims, that the Board specify
- 10 for future certification cycles that there be funding set
- 11 aside for independent third party audits in the event that
- 12 there is not available staff expertise here at the Board
- 13 at the time the certifications are submitted to be able to
- 14 evaluate the compliance claims.
- Those are the five primary issues that we
- 16 wish to raise. In addition, and we did not include this
- 17 subsequent issue because it is not something that we can
- 18 address within the context of the existing regulations,
- 19 there was significant concern raised about the inability
- 20 of product manufacturers to be able to truly do a good job
- 21 in demonstrating past compliance when past compliance is
- 22 really two to three calendar years ago.
- The record keeping measures are such,
- 24 especially with the various company takeovers that have
- 25 occurred this past several years, that it is very

- 1 difficult to be able to substantiate the claim and that
- 2 presented tremendous difficulty on the part of many
- 3 product manufacturers during this last cycle.
- 4 With that, I would be happy to answer any
- 5 questions, and you probably have speakers as well.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions? What was
- 7 the general response of the industry in assisting us in
- 8 some of these areas such as acquiring the right corporate
- 9 name? Obviously we're a regulator, but I remember when we
- 10 started out with the list, there was no one wanting to
- 11 give us a list and we simply went to the computer and got
- 12 the list. Then all of a sudden it was fine, we had a
- 13 list, and so on and so forth, but what were some of the
- 14 efforts made by those who were involved in the process
- 15 outside of staff?
- MS. TRGOVCICH: What I can say is that with
- 17 respect to the trade associations that have been involved
- 18 with the Board in putting this process together, that they
- 19 were extremely helpful at the outset. And once the
- 20 notices went out, we provided them with copies of the
- 21 certification lists, and they worked with their membership
- 22 to be able to follow up on compliance. The problem that
- 23 we encountered is that many, many of these product
- 24 manufacturers are not members of the trade associations
- 25 that the Board normally deals with, and once again, many

- 1 of them were not even regulated to begin with.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: Under your categories, we
- 3 should be able to get at some of these individuals who
- 4 either are part of the trade association and or are under
- 5 a category, perhaps resin manufacturers as opposed to the
- 6 middle persons, the actual Sears, the retail level,
- 7 basically which was one of the issues that was raised
- 8 early on. Is that part of that category?
- 9 MS. TRGOVCICH: The categories are
- 10 extensive. They would enable us to get at many of the
- 11 product manufacturers that are not represented by trade
- 12 associations before the Board. However, the issue as it
- 13 pertains to Sears, the question of who is a product
- 14 manufacturer, right now in regulation the product
- 15 manufacturer is identified as the manufacturer whose name
- 16 is on the label. And so our only avenue is to be able to
- 17 pursue that listed entity on the label at the time.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: We went over a lot of
- 21 these things. I haven't seen it in print yet until today,
- 22 but I'd like us to be able to take some time and make
- 23 comments on this, maybe over the course of the next few
- 24 weeks on some of these proposals, because I think a lot of
- 25 it makes sense.

1

```
I think that one thing that bothered me
   about the last one was when we go after 500 random, if
 3
    there is somebody that falls into that category and that
    person competes with four other businesses and we only
 5
    address that one, then that person could be at a
    competitive advantage or disadvantage in how he -- on how
 7
    that company can compete with those other three. So I
    would like to at least see us trying to -- I don't care
    what the number is. I don't care if the number is 500
    that we start with, but just try to keep them in the same
    category so everybody is playing on the same playing field
11
    as opposed to, one, 3M. Loctite comes in but Permatex
12
    doesn't, these guys don't, so you've got four people that
13
14
    compete with Loctite that don't have to comply with the
    same rules doesn't seem fair. And also it doesn't seem
15
    like we are getting the biggest bang for our buck.
16
17
                   We would probably have more impact if we
    take steps that address segments of industry instead of a
18
    shotgun approach to everybody in industry. I would like
19
    to be able to articulate that a little bit better,
21
    whatever the pleasure of the Chairman of the Board is, but
    I would like to at least give some thought to that, to
23
    articulate a way to do that when we go deal with the next
24
    item.
25
                   CHAIRMAN EATON: I only have one speaker
```

- 1 slip, believe it or not. Two, I guess, now coming up.
- 2 Mr. Randy Pollack, and I see a few more coming up. I was
- 3 hoping.
- 4 Mr. Pollack, how are you?
- 5 MR. POLLACK: Very good. Mr. Chairman and
- 6 Members of the Board, Randy Pollack on behalf of the Soap
- 7 and Detergent Association.
- 8 I would first like to thank the Board staff
- 9 for meeting with us to discuss the pros and cons of the
- 10 1996 certification process. I think we both were ready to
- 11 give input and determine the best way to proceed in the
- 12 future.
- One concern I would like to raise is
- 14 regarding the record keeping requirements. This is of
- 15 concern to industry. We are concerned that the
- 16 information we may be giving, we want to make sure that
- 17 there's no release of that proprietary information. We're
- 18 concerned that there's currently not in the statute any
- 19 sort of legal ramifications that we could take if there
- 20 was a release of the information by the Board. That's why
- 21 we chose to go to a third party accounting firm. I
- 22 understand that there were some problems with the
- 23 accounting firm, but then again, I think that we all had
- 24 some problems in this process since it was the first time.
- 25 As you can see with the companies, we weren't sure who the

- 1 container manufacturers are, and I think that is something
- 2 that is developing during that time.
- Additionally, I believe that there's other
- 4 departments that have statutory procedures as to how to
- 5 handle confidential information. I believe one of them is
- 6 the Department of Conservation. I don't have the
- 7 information with me today, but also I believe discussed in
- 8 the regulations is how secure is that database, who has
- 9 access to that information. But I want to raise that
- 10 point as a discussion issue and probably this will be
- 11 ongoing, hopefully for the next few weeks.
- 12 Thank you.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. Questions of
- 14 Mr. Pollack?
- Mr. Rick Best, Californians Against Waste.
- MR. BEST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
- 17 Board Members. Rick Best with Californians Against Waste.
- 18 I think a lot of the issues that
- 19 Ms. Trgovcich has indicated I think are appropriate areas
- 20 to discuss. I think I want to bring up a couple of issues
- 21 that haven't been specifically addressed.
- 22 First, I think -- I concur with Mr. Jones's
- 23 comment about I think there's a lot of companies that
- 24 aren't being targeted and I think it's the Board's
- 25 responsibility in terms of when it pursues certification

- 1 to be looking at the broader range of companies that are
- 2 out there, and to specifically target one company and not
- 3 others that are out there, I think that's something that
- 4 needs to be addressed.
- 5 I think obviously the Board, in its first
- 6 go around, had a mailing list that it was dealing with,
- 7 and as it gets more understanding of this program it's
- 8 going to add to that mailing list, but I think the Board
- 9 and any future certification needs to make sure that it's
- 10 looking at the full range of companies that are out there
- 11 and not just looking at a specific list and randomly
- 12 targeting those companies. So I think that the Board
- 13 needs to be, to fulfill its responsibility in terms of an
- 14 effective enforcement, needs to be looking at the full
- 15 range of companies that are out there.
- That being said, obviously the Board should
- 17 focus on those companies that are likely to be regulated.
- 18 Those companies that are exempted or statutorily exempted
- 19 from the law, there isn't a need for the Board to
- 20 specifically target those companies. The Board should be
- 21 focused on those companies that ought to be or are likely
- 22 to be regulated by the Board.
- 23 And I don't know whether this is
- 24 appropriate for this discussion or perhaps Item Number 26.
- 25 I guess most of my comments focused on the compliance.

- 1 Once the Board has gone through the certification process
- 2 and has identified companies that are not in compliance,
- 3 what the Board's procedure or what the Board is going to
- 4 pursue what they've done in '96 and what they're going to
- 5 do in '97. I guess I have to reiterate our concerns or
- 6 our objections that were raised at the last meeting in
- 7 terms of the Board's approach, whether it pursues an
- 8 enforcement option or whether it pursues a compliance
- 9 agreement.
- 10 I understand the Board's interpretation in
- 11 terms of its flexibility in this case, but I think it's
- 12 appropriate for the Board to fulfill its enforcement
- 13 responsibility, and I think the compliance agreements that
- 14 have been laid out in 1996 thus far are basically waiving
- 15 the responsibility of these companies for '96, '97, '98,
- 16 and '99. I shouldn't say waiving the responsibility, but
- 17 waving the Board's taking enforcement action against those
- 18 companies on the idea that there would be future
- 19 compliance in the year 2000.
- I think the compliance agreements that are
- 21 negotiated are much tighter in addressing some of those
- 22 issues, but I think the fundamental issue that this Board
- 23 needs to address is these companies that have come before
- 24 the Board thus far are companies that failed to meet the
- 25 1996 requirements, and I think it's appropriate for the

- 1 Board to pursue an enforcement action against those
- 2 companies. I think the Board has taken this approach for
- 3 '96, but I don't think that's the approach that the Board
- 4 should take in future years.
- 5 I took a look at the agenda item that was
- 6 prepared by the staff several months ago when the Board
- 7 was looking at these various options, and the option of
- 8 pursuing a compliance agreement, it was estimated a staff
- 9 time, I think, of 23 hours, and for pursuing an actual
- 10 penalty hearing process, I think, was on the order of 38
- 11 hours. So we're not talking about a significant amount
- 12 difference. Obviously there is an increased amount of
- 13 staff time, but I think it's appropriate for the Board to
- 14 demonstrate its resolve in pursuing enforcement of this
- 15 law.
- 16 If the Board wants to take an enforcement
- 17 action and then seek remedies where the company was to do
- 18 something over and above the requirements of the law to
- 19 mitigate that, that's something for the Board to consider,
- 20 but I think for the Board to enter into a compliance
- 21 agreement without soliciting a higher level of commitment
- 22 of the company to comply with the law, I think, is
- 23 inappropriate. And based upon our review of what's gone
- 24 on this far, we think that in future years the Board
- 25 should be looking at taking those steps in terms of what's

- 1 laid out in the law of taking penalty enforcement
- 2 hearings.
- I think that's the main issue that I wanted
- 4 to address and would be happy to take any questions.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of Mr. Best?
- 6 When you speak in terms of the remedy, Mr. Best, of the
- 7 compliance, are you saying take an enforcement action and
- 8 suspend that enforcement action? Are you saying -- I want
- 9 to be clear. You don't have any real dispute with
- 10 compliance orders, it's how they're placed and whether you
- 11 use it as a substitute for the original enforcement?
- MR. BEST: We definitely believe that the
- 13 Board has a responsibility under the law in terms of to
- 14 take enforcement action. So I think first and foremost,
- 15 the Board ought to in the future, and when a company comes
- 16 up and it's demonstrated that they have failed to comply
- 17 with the law, that the Board should pursue its enforcement
- 18 remedies.
- Now, if it comes out that there's
- 20 mitigating circumstances and the Board decides to perhaps,
- 21 as they have with local governments, if it was a company
- 22 that was at 24 percent recycled content and the Board
- 23 decides to mitigate that penalty based upon that, that's
- 24 something the Board can consider. But I think absolutely
- 25 the Board should pursue adoption or having a penalty

- 1 hearing and invoking a penalty against a company that has
- 2 failed to comply with the law.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: That's one of the
- 4 quandaries we face, as you well know, where we've been
- 5 dealing in the past with retroactive application and
- 6 trying to change behavior for the future, and I think
- 7 that's sort of a continuing debate in how we can blend
- 8 those two.
- 9 MR. BEST: Right.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sort of remedial kinds of
- 11 remedies, I think are going to be.
- 12 MR. BEST: I've had these discussions with
- 13 staff and some of the representatives of the Board, and we
- 14 certainly recognize that there are some things that can be
- 15 done to try and improve, to try and bring up the schedule
- 16 in terms of trying to help the Board get closer to try and
- 17 shorten that time period when the enforcement -- when the
- 18 law requirements are in place and when the actual
- 19 enforcement or determination of the rate is taken. And we
- 20 certainly think it's appropriate to try and close that
- 21 gap, but ultimately that may result in a fundamental
- 22 change, as was discussed previously, as a legislative
- 23 change.
- I think ultimately some of these issues are
- 25 going to have to be addressed in that regard and we hope

```
1 that can be a subject of legislation next year to try and
```

- 2 resolve some of those issues. I think the Board is in a
- 3 position of enforcing the law as it is right now, and I
- 4 think the Board -- I think the law is pretty clear in
- 5 terms of what the responsibility to companies are.
- 6 They're responsible for complying with the law. If they
- 7 haven't complied with the law in 1996, even though it's
- 8 three years later, the fact remains these companies have
- 9 failed to comply with the law, and so the Board is fully
- 10 justified in taking enforcement action in those
- 11 situations.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I think one thing -- I
- 15 know when we had the item, and there was probably some
- 16 people in the audience that weren't here when we got to
- 17 deal with this thing -- but we had 500 people or 500
- 18 corporations that we tried to get to. And I think that
- 19 the compliance orders we put together and the fact that
- 20 Loctite is upset that we have the penalties if they do not
- 21 comply, goes to the heart of what you're saying, because
- 22 this Board said -- I think I'll speak -- I don't want to
- 23 speak for the whole Board, but I think that the whole
- 24 Board concurred that what we're really trying to do here
- 25 is get people to use recycled content plastic and not so

- 1 much fine somebody. And if we can, through our actions,
- 2 get people to use recycled content plastics, that goes to
- 3 the heart of the issue which is finding markets for this
- 4 material that we are collecting and giving the cities and
- 5 counties some relief. But by including the fact that
- 6 okay -- some of these corporations, I think, honestly
- 7 probably weren't as acutely aware of the law in California
- 8 as maybe we would have all liked them to be.
- 9 We said, "Okay. We'll give you a chance to
- 10 work through this, but if you do not, you're responsible
- 11 for fines for years '97, '98, '99," which sends a clear
- 12 message that we're willing to work with you, but if you
- 13 don't work with us, we will fine you, as opposed to just
- 14 being arbitrary and fining and hope to go get compliance
- 15 with a hammer. I think the only thing that happens then
- 16 is everybody then gets their lobbyists together and tries
- 17 to kill something. I don't think that fits what you want
- 18 or what I want or what this Board wants, certainly not
- 19 what the industry wants or the industry that collects all
- 20 this plastic.
- 21 So I would hope that that will -- I hope
- 22 that logic gives you and your organization at least a
- 23 glimmer of hope that we are playing both the role of
- 24 advocate as well as enforcer in these compliance orders
- 25 because I think we are.

1

```
MR. BEST: I think the principal that
   you're suggesting, I understand that. I think the problem
   that we have is that here we are, 19 -- enforcing for
    1996, and basically a company is given essentially a free
 5
    ride for '96, '97, '98 and '99, a four-year period. So
    here's a company --
 7
                   BOARD MEMBER JONES: If they comply, if
    they create packaging that has 25 percent recycled content
    or is lightweighted from this day forward. Right?
 9
                  MR. BEST: From the year 2000 forward.
10
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right.
11
12
                   MR. BEST: Right. But I guess what I'm
    suggesting is at least for those four years, '96, '97, '98
14
    and '99, those companies may not be in compliance.
    Certainly they weren't in compliance in '96, and unless
    something has changed, they probably aren't in compliance
16
    in '97, '98, and '99. So here you have a company that
17
    has -- the law has been on the books since 1990 or '91.
18
    So the law has been on the books, they've known about it.
19
20
                   Maybe they can argue that they didn't know
21
    about it, but the fact is that a lot of companies knew
    this law was on the books, and so for a four-year period
23 they have failed to comply with the law. And the approach
   is that we're going to sign this compliance agreement and
25 promise to do that in the year 2000, and that's the
```

```
1 difficulty that we have.
```

- 2 If we're talking about a short time line
- 3 where you're talking about a year from when the Board
- 4 makes that agreement or the Board determines that you're
- 5 out of compliance when it actually was in place, that
- 6 becomes a different story because then you have an
- 7 immediate type of approach. But when you're talking about
- 8 a four-year period, you're talking about giving up quite a
- 9 bit of enforcement leverage for failing to meet the
- 10 requirements.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right.
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Would you be willing to
- 13 consider or to work on a situation where our language is
- 14 that from when -- you say the year 2000, but we're only 45
- 15 days away from the year 2000. So it's a lot closer than
- 16 that -- wherein as part of that boiler plate language,
- 17 that if we did enter into one of these compliance
- 18 agreements, let's say for those years -- '97, '98 and '99,
- 19 that if you failed to comply with the compliance
- 20 agreement, that you could also go back in and would be
- 21 subjected to those fines for those previous years as well?
- MR. BEST: I believe that's the existing
- 23 agreement.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Correct. So how would
- 25 that then -- that's my understanding as well. So how

- 1 would that go against what you're trying to say because it
- 2 does give us the enforcement mechanism that if they don't
- 3 comply with the change of behavior that they've agreed to,
- 4 we then can go back in basically and sort of hang them or
- 5 provide enforcement that we could have done originally.
- 6 I'm just kind of wondering. Is it
- 7 something that is just philosophical? It would seem to us
- 8 that's kind of a fair approach as to what we're trying to
- 9 do here. I agree with you, but at some point we've got to
- 10 try to change behavior as well. For some we should just
- 11 probably fine them outright, and others we will probably
- 12 want to work, but when you have a company like Toro which
- 13 technologically I learned something, that they can't put
- 14 certain kinds of products in a particular type of bottle,
- 15 and that they're willing to then change that way of doing
- 16 business or with that particular product, but they need
- 17 time to do it. I think that serves a public policy goal.
- 18 And those are sort of tradeoffs.
- 19 Like you say, it's a judgment call for each
- 20 of them and I just don't want it to be a hard and fast
- 21 rule.
- MR. BEST: Well, I think In the case of a
- 23 company that hasn't complied or complains that they can't
- 24 comply, the fact is the law applies equally to all
- 25 companies. So if it's a situation not being able to

- 1 comply with the law, that's something that they ought to
- 2 bring up at the legislature and try and address if they
- 3 think that there's -- the law isn't created in a way for
- 4 them to do business but yet meet the state's diversion and
- 5 plastics recycling goals. I think that's an issue that
- 6 maybe needs to be addressed legislatively.
- 7 I think a lot of these issues, in terms of
- 8 how this law is implemented, those are some topics that
- 9 ultimately maybe there needs to be that discussion, and
- 10 we're open to having that discussion as part of a broader
- 11 context of how do we strengthen this law and improve its
- 12 enforcement capabilities. I guess ultimately it is
- 13 though, asking in terms of if it's a philosophical thing,
- 14 the fact is that the law, as its laid out, has the
- 15 requirements. They've been on the books for a number of
- 16 years and here are companies that have come forward, that
- 17 have failed to comply with the law.
- Now the Board, in its process, both local
- 19 governments and other angles, has looked at well, to what
- 20 extent had they failed to meet it and use that as a
- 21 measurement for to what extent they ought to issue
- 22 penalties. But I think the fact is these are companies
- 23 that have failed to meet the requirements of the law and
- 24 the Board ought to go through its process of taking that
- 25 enforcement action. Maybe they don't get issued a

- 1 \$100,000 penalty, maybe they get issued whatever penalty.
- 2 The penalty is based on to what degree to which the
- 3 company has failed to comply with the law, but I think
- 4 ultimately these are companies that didn't meet the
- 5 requirements of the law, so I think the Board ought to, in
- 6 future years, go forward with that process.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. I have one
- 8 other speaker, Mr. Lance Hastings from the Grocery
- 9 Manufacturers of America.
- 10 MR. HASTINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
- 11 Members. Lance Hastings From the Grocery Manufacturers of
- 12 America.
- I didn't know that I was going to comment
- 14 today until we saw the agenda item. We appreciate the
- 15 fact it was circulated. I have to apologize as well that
- 16 I was not involved in the working group session where a
- 17 lot of these issues were discussed and in the paper. I
- 18 will tell you, though, that I have been working with the
- 19 Board staff.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: You're fine.
- 21 MR. HASTINGS: And my colleagues on this
- 22 topic. I can't underscore enough the need to protect the
- 23 proprietary information. That's been a familiar refrain
- 24 of ours since we started on this nearly two years ago,
- 25 that by dropping that one critical piece of information

- 1 that reveals the number of containers involved in the
- 2 stream of commerce gives up the competitive advantage or
- 3 disadvantage that one of our member companies may have.
- 4 And that data is protected as you might imagine as tough
- 5 as any other data, including profits and revenues. That
- 6 is critical data.
- 7 We came to an agreement last year to have a
- 8 third party act as the go-between in the (inaudible) of
- 9 that information, and for whatever reason -- maybe there's
- 10 a lot of reasons -- Price-Waterhouse wasn't the
- 11 appropriate entity. But that is an issue that our members
- 12 are very concerned about. Before this Board embarks on a
- 13 different type of regime to protect that information, we
- 14 certainly would like to keep the dialogue going, and
- 15 Mr. Jones's suggestion of keeping this item on discussion
- 16 for the next few weeks is something that we would be
- 17 interested in, and we can get more participation from our
- 18 members as well.
- I want to also echo a thing that I guess
- 20 has become a broken record here at the Board, in calling
- 21 for a prospective compliance and verification and
- 22 calculation of the rate, Mr. Best is partially correct.
- 23 The law is having difficulty being complied with. Well,
- 24 it's a bad law, and contrary to Mr. Frasie (phonetic) the
- 25 best way to do with an unjust law is to enforce it to its

- 1 extreme.
- 2 We need to draw a new line in the sand and
- 3 get real and reasonable about how we approach our
- 4 packaging. It is troubling to me to hear that the first
- 5 line of defense ought to be an enforcement action that
- 6 includes a penalty because they were out of compliance for
- 7 a given year. That's the easy answer. The creative
- 8 answer, the answer this Board has pursued over the last
- 9 year, is to enter into agreements and discussions and
- 10 dialogue with companies that are, in fact, subject to this
- 11 law. That's something that we welcome, we appreciate it,
- 12 and in fact, we have been part of that discussion, but it
- 13 is very troubling when you know for a certain year that
- 14 somebody or some company was, in fact, not in compliance
- 15 to say, "Open your checkbook and let's get to business
- 16 because we're going to get you next year and the year
- 17 after and the year after until you're in compliance," and
- 18 this Board has entered into approximately eight compliance
- 19 agreements that seem reasonable, that have protections,
- 20 both for the company, for the Board, and for those who
- 21 want to see the change in behavior to using more recycled
- 22 material in their containers. That's something we
- 23 support.
- The Board has been very farsighted in terms
- 25 of that approach and we support it, but we do need to have

```
1 a continued dialogue before we embark on a 1997 compliance
```

- 2 scheme that, if it resembles anything like 1996, I think
- 3 we're going to have the same kind of problems. I would
- 4 beseech the Board to continue the dialogue with us and our
- 5 members and my colleagues who have spoken before to have a
- 6 better process before we get locked down into a regime for
- 7 1997.
- MS. TOBIAS: Mr. Chair, may I ask a
- 9 question?
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure. Ms. Tobias.
- MS. TOBIAS: In the PRC, Section 42323 does
- 12 say that proprietary information shall not be made public,
- 13 so what is it that you would be looking for?
- MR. HASTINGS: I would have to check with
- 15 our folks, but it was that same regulation that was in the
- 16 books when we embarked on negotiations regarding
- 17 Price-Waterhouse, that if made available to the general
- 18 public was our concern. We don't want it to be disclosed
- 19 at all. And I don't know how you classify the public
- 20 versus general, staff here or a Board Member. I don't
- 21 know. I do recall that was the major concern.
- MS. TOBIAS: It seems fairly
- 23 straightforward to me, "shall not be made available to the
- 24 general public," but --
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: That would be enough for

```
1 us to deny a public records request I would think.
```

- 2 MS. TOBIAS: Sure.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: If that's what you're
- 4 concerned about.
- 5 MR. HASTINGS: I would have to review why
- 6 we got to the situation with Price-Waterhouse.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: One of the things that
- 10 Mr. Best had said in his testimony earlier -- Mr. Pollack.
- 11 I'm sorry. There was no -- what if -- okay. We're not
- 12 supposed to divulge it, but let's just say by accident we
- 13 did. What is the recourse of that harmed industry against
- 14 us for not living by the law?
- MS. TOBIAS: They can basically take us to
- 16 court. They can -- that means we would have violated the
- 17 law because it says "shall not be made available to the
- 18 general public." They would show their damages and the
- 19 judgement would be basically we would be responsible for
- 20 paying whatever damages were deemed to have occurred for
- 21 the release of that information. So I guess that's why I
- 22 asked, is that I'm not quite clear, and maybe they can
- 23 help us by telling you what else they're either concerned
- 24 about or that they want in this because I'm not clear why
- 25 this doesn't cover the situation, but we can certainly

- 1 look into that.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. I think we'll
- 3 take a ten-minute break. The court reporter needs a
- 4 break. I know I do. We'll reconvene at 3:15.
- 5 (Brief recess taken.)
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Welcome back,
- 7 everyone. Members, welcome back. Thank you for your
- 8 promptness.
- 9 Any ex partes to report, Mr. Pennington?
- 10 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Not from me.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, I said
- 13 "hi" to my friend Steve South from EDCO, Evan Edgar, and
- 14 the honorable Council Member George Williams from the City
- 15 of Auburn, and said "hi" to Rick Best and Chuck Helget.
- 16 And I think that was it.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right.
- Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 20 Mr. Chair. I'm still completing that list of that one
- 21 meet-and-greet. There was a Jim Petrolis from So-Lag
- 22 Disposal, Efrin Herrera from Park Disposal, and I'll get
- 23 the exact name for the representative from EDCO.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: And during the break, I
- 25 just had a meet-and-greet with Jim Leitz (phonetic),

- 1 former coworker and now advocate for many, many
- 2 industries, and George Larsen regarding RPPC. Okay.
- 3 Next item, I believe, is Item Number 26 and
- 4 my understanding is Mr. John Nuffer is going to make this
- 5 presentation.
- 6 MR. NUFFER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman
- 7 and Board Members.
- 8 As you recall, last December and then in
- 9 January, we came to you with two different items with
- 10 many, many alternatives for pursuing compliance related to
- 11 the 1996 recycling rate for rigid plastics, and based on
- 12 your direction to pursue a certification path for 1996,
- 13 we've kept these options, including the voluntary options,
- 14 fewer than before.
- To start with, the Board does have
- 16 discretion to take enforcement action or not to take
- 17 enforcement action, and we've provided basically four
- 18 options today for your consideration. The first is an
- 19 enforcement option and the other three are basically not
- 20 enforcement options.
- 21 The first option would be to conduct a
- 22 certification and enforcement process similar to the one
- 23 we are concluding for the 1996 year, and that would
- 24 include certification of compliance for whatever target
- 25 group the Board decides upon. We would develop or propose

- 1 to develop compliance agreements with cooperative
- 2 companies and then schedule public hearings for companies
- 3 that have been uncooperative or unresponsive. And if you
- 4 choose this enforcement option, we would propose to come
- 5 back at a later point with the certification proposal
- 6 based -- addressing some of the issues that Caren
- 7 mentioned earlier, including some of your comments
- 8 earlier, including who do we target, which companies or
- 9 industries, what do we do about record keeping, do we want
- 10 to change the content of the certification forms, and can
- 11 we identify a cutoff date for the submission of data from
- 12 manufacturers.
- 13 The second option relates to one of the
- 14 first, option two, the first non-enforcement option. That
- 15 option basically is to publicize the 1997 rates widely to
- 16 let people know that the recycling rate for rigid plastic
- 17 is trending downward and that the Board intends at a
- 18 future date to pursue a compliance certification. That
- 19 can be for the year 2000. It could be for another year.
- 20 Option three would be to work with trade
- 21 associations on a voluntary basis, and there are some that
- 22 we're working with now that have been very interested in
- 23 working with us, to try to work out voluntary
- 24 industry-wide programs.
- 25 And the fourth option would be to support

- 1 research and testing which would provide more information
- 2 so that companies, product manufacturers, would know more
- 3 about what they can use in terms of post-consumer resin.
- 4 From time to time we run across misinformation. A
- 5 container manufacturer might not use post-consumer resin
- 6 and might not let their product manufacturer know that
- 7 that's available.
- 8 So basically we're providing you with four
- 9 options. One is option one, to take enforcement action
- 10 for the '97 year, similar to the 1996 year; and if you
- 11 choose that option, we would propose to come back with a
- 12 completed certification proposal for your review and
- 13 consideration.
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: How long do you think that
- 15 would be? January? February? I'm not trying to nail you
- 16 down, because I assume at this point the process would be
- 17 meeting with the working group, again trying to resolve
- 18 some of the issues that either Mr. Best or others had
- 19 brought up about, you know, problems or hurdles we've had,
- 20 the proprietary issue, those kinds of things. I'm not
- 21 trying to lock you into a date, but I'm trying to get some
- 22 sense for us how long that would take.
- Some of these seem to be options that seem
- 24 to be not mutually exclusive, but actually part of what we
- 25 should be doing anyway. I want to get some sense for the

```
1 Board Members how long it might take.
```

- 2 MS. TRGOVCICH: I believe that the earliest
- 3 we could return to you with a certification proposal would
- 4 be at your January meeting. One of the important things
- 5 to note, that if you choose to have us develop a
- 6 certification proposal, is that the regulations specify
- 7 that manufacturers are to retain their records for two
- 8 years from the end of the compliance year, if they're
- 9 using the primary option most manufacturers use which is
- 10 post-consumer resin compliance option.
- If you choose to pursue that option, we
- 12 will need direction to notify product manufacturers of the
- 13 extension of the records retention time period because we
- 14 will be moving into the third calendar year on January 1.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The -- we don't have a
- 18 resolution, but I'm going to propose something because I
- 19 think we have to enforce this law.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Before you actually
- 21 propose the motion, I just want to have a couple of
- 22 comments from some of the previous speakers --
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- either Mr. Best or
- 25 someone from the trade association, with regard to the

- 1 enforcement that the records retention issue, any thoughts
- 2 or support or opposition to that because that is a
- 3 complication and I think legally we are able to provide
- 4 that notice.
- 5 MS. TRGOVCICH: We can provide that notice.
- 6 You did that for this last calendar year to extend it into
- 7 1999.
- 8 I would just like to provide with you one
- 9 other point of information. We are approaching the point
- 10 in time in which the information will be available in the
- 11 next several months from the Board's statewide
- 12 characterization study. That information will be used to
- 13 calculate the 1998 and 1999 all-container recycling rates
- 14 and PETE rates. We will be in a position, likely in
- 15 spring, the March-April time frame, to return to you with
- 16 a calculation item for 1998 and 1999.
- So I wanted you to have that information as
- 18 you discuss this.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: But --
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- the calculation
- 22 issues that the waste generations or characterization
- 23 study is going to provide was always intended for '98-'99.
- 24 '97, everybody I thought agreed -- didn't we include --
- 25 maybe it wasn't '97, it was '98 -- that we included using

```
1 both processors and reclaimers.
```

- MS. TRGOVCICH: For '97. Waste
- 3 characterization --
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: We went through a lot.
- 5 You guys went through a lot of work, and the industry did,
- 6 to make sure, and I think, you know, that satisfies me
- 7 that the number is right and that, you know, we need to
- 8 continue down this path of compliance orders, enforcement
- 9 actions, those types of things.
- 10 MS. TRGOVCICH: I guess to be more direct,
- 11 the reason that I was raising that was because in four
- 12 months down the road, you may be in the position in the
- 13 event that the rate falls below 25 percent for '98 and/or
- 14 '99, to initiate a subsequent certification process very
- 15 soon in the new calendar year.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right. But that would
- 17 be for years '98.
- MS. TRGOVCICH: For '98 and '99.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And we're dealing with
- 20 '97.
- I saw Lance walk in.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: If there's any comments by
- 23 Mr. Hastings or Mr. Best with regards to those issues.
- 24 MR. HASTINGS: Lance Hastings again from
- 25 the Grocery Manufacturers of America.

```
1 For the 1996 year, we had reached an
```

- 2 agreement based upon reading the regulations and the
- 3 statute that an extension was in order. You guys
- 4 communicated that to the product manufacturers. I don't
- 5 know if the time limit is a limit, in fact, so I don't
- 6 know if it's as big a concern as was mentioned. You had
- 7 the option to exercise to extend records retention, so
- 8 don't rush into a compliance.
- 9 (Laughter)
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Would we have your support
- 11 in case any of your member organizations decided to
- 12 challenge us on the records retention?
- 13 (Laughter)
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: Pardon? I didn't get that
- 15 for the record.
- MR. BEST: With regards to the record
- 17 retention, I'm not really versed in terms of the
- 18 legalities, but I think certainly extending so that the
- 19 folks can have that data available to the -- so that they
- 20 can report it is certainly appropriate.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: The catch-22 here is if we
- 22 don't take the enforcement action by the end of 1999, it
- 23 becomes 2000, then the question could arise as to whether
- 24 or not they were legally obligated to retain their
- 25 records, but if we decide or if we choose to go the

- 1 enforcement route, it's going to take us some time to put
- 2 together a package, a work group like we've always done,
- 3 do we run the risk of losing some because of the records
- 4 retention issue. So that's sort of the catch-22 for the
- 5 Board, you know, whether they have to do an enforcement
- 6 thing today which sort of freezes the records retention,
- 7 or do we have the flexibility to say we can extend it past
- 8 there but the records retention extension time frame
- 9 allows us still to keep them within the net.
- 10 MR. BEST: I guess in terms the -- whether
- 11 the Board should proceed now or at a later date, I guess
- 12 at this point it would be our recommendation that the
- 13 Board proceed now as if they were going to go forward with
- 14 the '97 certification process. It was indicated that the
- 15 Board is going to be looking at '98 and '99. I think if
- 16 the timing was right, it might be appropriate to combine
- 17 those, but I think at this point there are a lot of issues
- 18 that have been raised with regards to the certification
- 19 process. Those ought to get worked out first with the
- 20 understanding the Board is prepared to pursue a
- 21 certification process for '97. So that would be our, you
- 22 know, our recommendation.
- I think our concern is that if the Board
- 24 waits until April or May to pursue a certification
- 25 process, a lot of those issues may not have been worked

- 1 out and at what point whether the certification process
- 2 really be going into place. We would like to see at least
- 3 a lot of these issues that have been raised with regards
- 4 to the certification process be dealt with now and the
- 5 Board indicate its intention to pursue a certification
- 6 process for '97 so that companies are aware that the Board
- 7 is going to be taking an action.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think that's where
- 9 Mr. Jones was going, but wanted to have some time frame or
- 10 some of the comments that you made incorporated in that,
- 11 so I was asking sort of the time frame that we would do
- 12 that. I don't know what he had in his motion but we'll
- 13 see if that's all in there. So let's let him make his
- 14 motion and see if that's part of it.
- MS. TOBIAS: Mr. Chair, can I just ask
- 16 something?
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure.
- 18 MS. TOBIAS: I guess the other point I
- 19 would make is I don't -- it seems to me we could also
- 20 change the regs on record compliance. You could do an
- 21 emergency change on that. In my mind that's really not --
- 22 that shouldn't be an impediment to what the Board wants to
- 23 do in terms of trying to go forward with the compliance on
- 24 this. I think since we've done it in regulations, it
- 25 means that we chose a period of time that we thought was

```
1 reasonable at the time. If it's not reasonable now, then
```

- 2 maybe we need to change that part of it.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. That's really
- 4 helpful, and that would be under the emergency reg
- 5 provision --
- 6 MS. TOBIAS: Right.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- we could move forward
- 8 with that.
- 9 MS. TOBIAS: I think we could do it in
- 10 time, and I think if the Board indicated they wanted to do
- 11 that, we could certainly put the parties on notice that
- 12 that's what we were going to do. So to me that's -- I
- 13 don't want to say it's a non-issue, but I think it's a
- 14 fixable issue.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, this
- 17 is -- this motion is going to be more in the way of
- 18 direction, obviously, because there's not the "whereases"
- 19 and the "therefores."
- I think that we move to require
- 21 certification for the 1997 compliance year, take the
- 22 appropriate enforcement action including the development
- 23 of compliance agreements and the imposition of fines and
- 24 penalties, that we extend the -- or that we do a
- 25 notification to make sure that we've extended the time for

- 1 the records retention, that we look through the SIC Code
- 2 to try to find competitor-type businesses so if we're
- 3 going after a 3M, it includes 3M and those companies that
- 4 compete on those lines for a total of -- what did we have
- 5 last time? 500?
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: 500 was just the initial.
- 7 That's what I think the Board settled on. There was a
- 8 push by some.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: For 10,000.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Well, you know. I think
- 11 that the smaller the sample, the same kind of problems you
- 12 have taking place that we're now being sort of, you know,
- 13 criticized, the fact that some of the categories aren't as
- 14 large because you find that they aren't regulated, so the
- 15 larger the net, the greater the sampling and probably the
- 16 greater likelihood that you won't have some of the impacts
- 17 that there are in just singling out part of that because
- 18 of the small sample.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Then I would --
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: The problem was, remember,
- 21 this was the first time we went through it. It was
- 22 difficult to get a list. Many of us compiled a list off
- 23 the web. Airplane magazines where resin manufacturers
- 24 were advertising was another great source, believe it or
- 25 not, we found a lot of companies in Texas, those kinds of

```
1 things. I think where I'm trying to go is saying we
```

- 2 should -- I think what you wanted to do is just basically
- 3 have the staff prepare --
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Prepare to contact
- 5 between 750 and a thousand businesses and to start
- 6 emergency regs to extend or to redefine the time retention
- 7 change to three or four years, whatever the Board's
- 8 pleasure is.
- 9 MS. TOBIAS: Can I get some clarification
- 10 on that?
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: You want me to try and
- 12 repeat the motion? I think I know where Mr. Jones wants
- 13 to go. I'm not sure, and you know it's really a sad day
- 14 when I can start to interpret another Board Member's
- 15 motions and that, but I think that --
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: You do okay. It's
- 17 just when you're mad, you make us repeat them.
- 18 (Laughter)
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: Obviously I'm quite
- 20 jovial today.
- 21 (Laughter)
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's why I took the
- 23 chance.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pollack, before I
- 25 begin obviously.

```
1 MR. POLLACK: Thank you. Randy Pollack on
```

- 2 behalf of the Soap and Detergent Association.
- I would ask the Board to consider those
- 4 companies who were part of the certification process in
- 5 1996 maybe to be excluded from the 1997.
- 6 Thank you.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Let me ask --
- 10 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Go ahead.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: One of the issues,
- 12 like Toro was I think the only one that was identified.
- 13 Right? In that grouping. Is that -- was that accurate?
- 14 What would happen if we did Toro, Husqvarna, Black -- I
- 15 mean all the different lawnmower manufacturers that also
- 16 produce their own oil that goes in, wouldn't that level
- 17 the playing field for a Toro?
- MR. HASTINGS: Yes, it would, but I think
- 19 you're going to have selective enforcement and I think
- 20 that could be a problem for the Board. It's no longer a
- 21 random sampling.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: The only way you get a
- 23 round selective is if you turn over a list of all the
- 24 names of manufacturers. That's what we've been trying to
- 25 get at, and I think that solves the problem because I'm

- 1 willing to do that, but you can't argue selective
- 2 enforcement if you don't give us the information. It's
- 3 that simple.
- 4 MR. HASTINGS: The Soap and Detergent
- 5 Association did give our membership list last year.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: I wasn't speaking to you
- 7 personally, but I'm saying that's where we are with some
- 8 of the manufacturers. I think that's the key component
- 9 there. If we get them all out on the table, then you can
- 10 do a random sampling. Most of us have been involved in
- 11 sampling and polling and whatever and know the larger the
- 12 universe and the sample size that you use, the better
- 13 representative sample you have, and that's what we tried
- 14 to do. Everyone knows that even 500 is not good enough
- 15 for a statewide survey under standard polling in
- 16 California, and surely 500 nationwide is not really
- 17 representative of a sample, you know, nationwide. So I
- 18 think that's been part of our problem.
- 19 But I think what I was trying to get to is
- 20 what I would like to do is rather than getting specific
- 21 about what should or should not be part of the
- 22 certification process, whether it be the exclusion or, as
- 23 Mr. Best said, with regard to particular members, is that
- 24 we use the intervening time between now and January to
- 25 have the working group convene, get some of these issues

```
1 and bring them here, and then we will be able to decide as
```

- 2 Board Members which of those options or recommendations,
- 3 whether they be audit requirements, the notification
- 4 letter and some of the other issues were brought there in
- 5 terms of an actual agenda item.
- I think for us to now start picking and
- 7 choosing whether or not to do that is not what where we
- 8 want to probably be.
- 9 Ms. Tobias.
- 10 MS. TOBIAS: Mr. Chair, I wondered if you
- 11 wanted to give us specific direction on the emergency
- 12 regulations so that we could start that part of it. We're
- 13 thinking about just four years, of changing the reg to say
- 14 they have to be retained for four years, and whatever
- 15 Ms. Trgovcich thinks.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Would that require a
- 17 separate motion? Could that be part of Mr. Jones's
- 18 regular motion, and then with specific direction that that
- 19 part of the motion be brought back?
- MS. TOBIAS: Fine.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: In December.
- MS. TOBIAS: Which part are you going to
- 23 bring back? I think that --
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: The emergency regs.
- 25 MS. TOBIAS: I think if you can be specific

- 1 enough, because this item is noticed as it is for
- 2 consideration of certification enforcement and other
- 3 options, that if you can be specific enough, we can start
- 4 the emergency reg process with that direction. It
- 5 probably should be a separate motion, should be if you're
- 6 going to suggest the working group consider Mr. Jones's
- 7 recommendation and come back with one.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones, shall I --
- 9 Mr. Pennington.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'm wondering,
- 11 Mr. Chairman, if we shouldn't just take a little break and
- 12 write something out so we know what we're really doing
- 13 here. I'm -- we have these sometimes, these resolutions,
- 14 and we're not sure exactly what we have. If we could take
- 15 a minute or two and write something out so we could see
- 16 exactly what we're doing, it would be better for all of us
- 17 as well as staff.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Why don't I try to
- 19 articulate what the motion is, and if we can designate
- 20 someone as the taker and they could write that down and
- 21 give us a few minutes while we go on to another item and
- 22 then look at it that way. Would that --
- 23 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: That would be
- 24 fine.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. I think

- 1 Mr. Jones would like the motion to consist of would be to
- 2 require that the Board proceed with a -- to require
- 3 certifications for the 1997 compliance year and that that
- 4 include taking the appropriate enforcement actions
- 5 including the development of compliance agreements and the
- 6 imposition of fines and penalties; in addition, to proceed
- 7 with the notification of records, and also as part of the
- 8 option to explore the SIC Code as well as looking at the
- 9 items identified by staff that are implementation issues
- 10 and their recommendations, as well as the public comments
- 11 by those present today, and that those items be included
- 12 in the agenda item in the January meeting for the Board's
- 13 consideration.
- 14 The second motion would consist of
- 15 directing the staff to begin emergency regulations whereby
- 16 we would proceed to change the regulations from the
- 17 current two-year retention to four-year, and that would be
- 18 achieved through an emergency regulation process which
- 19 would be brought back before the Board next month,
- 20 December 1999.
- 21 MS. TOBIAS: I don't think we would
- 22 anticipate bringing the emergency regulation back before
- 23 the Board. We would simply initiate that regulation under
- 24 your direction. Now, if that's what you want or we can
- 25 certainly bring it back.

```
1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's the only
```

- 2 change; right?
- 3 MS. TOBIAS: All I see is a change from the
- 4 "two" to the "four," and if that's the only change you're
- 5 making, I think we can initiate that.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: So the second --
- 7 MS. TOBIAS: The second would just indicate
- 8 that the staff should initiate emergency regulation that
- 9 changes that regulation from two years to four years for
- 10 record retention.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I
- 12 think that's pretty clear. We could vote on that. It's
- 13 the other --
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: You're very kind. I just
- 15 don't think you want to hear it again, but you're very
- 16 kind.
- 17 (Laughter)
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. That being the
- 19 case, Mr. Jones moves and I guess Mr. Eaton seconds that
- 20 we adopt the Resolution as enunciated by Mr. Jones, but
- 21 before we do that, I see a one-minute -- I think
- $22\,$ Mr. Hastings is going to respond to my question or perhaps
- 23 he's going to --
- MR. HASTINGS: Do you have a new one for
- 25 me? Lance Hastings with the Grocery Manufacturers

- 1 Association.
- 2 I wanted one point of clarification. Does
- 3 this motion lock you into then just these items in terms
- 4 of pursuing compliance? For example, if the SIC Code is
- 5 discovered not to be the most efficient way to go about
- 6 it, will this motion limit you to look fully at that?
- 7 Because in the course of the next two months, we'll have a
- 8 discussion about what works and what doesn't work, I hope.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Maybe I wasn't clear, and
- 10 that could be the case, but the whole idea for the
- 11 intervening time period was to have the working group meet
- 12 and discuss those outstanding issues that were either
- 13 raised in the public testimony or the implementation
- 14 issues raised by Ms. Trgovcich or any of the other issues
- 15 and then it would be brought back. It doesn't lock
- 16 anything in. The staff may recommend that, but it would
- 17 be reviewed by the Board at the January meeting.
- MR. HASTINGS: Okay. Thank you,
- 19 Mr. Chairman.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Been a long
- 21 time since we had a roll call. Perhaps we should see if
- 22 we're still here. Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 25 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.

1

25

```
BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
 2
 3
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
 4
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
 5
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
                  Okay. Muddling through, Item 27.
 7
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: That was on both
8 pieces or the emergency regs?
9
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: On the first.
                  It was on the -- we're going to bring back
10
11 the enforcement. That was on the portion we have -- she
12 said we didn't have to have a motion on the --
13
                  MS. TOBIAS: I would just assume actually
14 that you do a motion on the --
15
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: On the regs?
16
                  MS. TOBIAS: If you're directing staff to
17 go ahead and initiate emergency.
18
                 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I blew it, so I'm
19 stuck with the vote.
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, I'll
20
21 make a motion that we direct staff to start emergency regs
22 changing the two-year record retention to four-year record
23 retention.
24
                 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
```

CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones moves and

BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.

- 1 Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we direct staff to
- 2 initiate emergency regulations changing record retention
- 3 from two to four years.
- Without objection, substitute the previous
- 5 roll call.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Wait. I'm sure
- 7 there's more. Hold on.
- 8 MS. TOBIAS: No. All I wanted to do was
- 9 say the section number, 17946.5.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: I'm not mad at you, but
- 11 would you repeat that?
- 12 (Laughter)
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: I'm just kidding.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Actually, I'd
- 15 like it in writing.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: 12- or 14-point type?
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Can't read either
- 18 one of them.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. So we will
- 20 just amend into that the appropriate section that was just
- 21 stated. All right.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Do we need to vote on
- 23 that?
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: I just said -- we voted.
- 25 Didn't even hurt.

```
1
                  Item Number 27.
                  MS. TRGOVCICH: Item Number 27 should be
 2
   very quick, Members. The item is listed as
    reconsideration of scheduling public hearings for
    enforcement of the RPPC law, and it lists the product
    manufacturers that you specified in your motion last
 7
    month.
                   Because of the motion we took last month,
 8
   this has prompted many of those product manufacturers to
 9
    get in touch with us for the first time in a year and a
    half, and we've seen considerable movement on their part.
11
    So we were unprepared to come to you today because as a
   result of those contacts, it appears that most of those
13
14
   companies are not regulated by this law. It appears at
   this time that the Belvin Bell Company is not regulated,
   the Dee Jewelry Manufacturing is not regulated, Milspec
    Fasteners is not regulated. NPL Technologies qualifies
    for the medical exemption, and that Uncle Milton
18
    Industries is not regulated.
                   We will be returning to you with this same
20
21
    item on the December agenda so that you can formalize the
    action or reconsideration of your action at that time. We
23 are proceeding to -- and we have already used a process
24 server to notify Chemlite Industries of the public hearing
25 scheduled for the December Board meeting, and we will be
```

- 1 proceeding to do the same with Loctite and Pep Boys, even
- 2 though we are proceeding to negotiate compliance
- 3 agreements with those last two manufacturers.
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. No action is
- 5 necessary. I think that completes at least for today's
- 6 agenda the Waste Prevention and Market Development area.
- 7 Thank you very much.
- 8 Local Assistance and Planning. For those
- 9 of you who may have just entered the Board room, we're
- 10 sort of hopping around under Local Assistance and Planning
- 11 Compliance. Items 2, 3, and 4 will be heard. Items 6
- 12 through 11 were on consent calendar and therefore have
- 13 already been disposed of.
- 14 Mr. Schiavo.
- MR. SCHIAVO: Yes. Kyle Pogue will be
- 16 making the presentation for the next two items.
- 17 MR. POGUE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
- 18 and Board Members. I'm Kyle Poque with the Office of
- 19 Local Assistance.
- 20 Agenda Item Number 2 is consideration of
- 21 staff recommendation to correct the base year and
- 22 reporting years for the previously approved Source
- 23 Reduction and Recycling Element; and consideration of the
- 24 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
- 25 Recycling Element for the City of Auburn of Placer County.

1

23

24

25

```
2 City of Auburn's Source Reduction and Recycling Element in
   accordance with the process described in the October 1997
   Board-approved biennial review process. The City of
   Auburn is successfully implementing a large majority of
   its Source Reduction and Recycling Element selected
 7 programs.
 8
                  Additionally, staff review the City of
 9 Auburn's request to correct the base year disposal amount
   and 1995 and 1996 reporting year disposal amounts. With
   these corrections, the City of Auburn's diversion rates
11
12 exceed the 1995 diversion goal. Board staff has
13 determined that the method used to calculate the diversion
14 rate has been adequately documented and is consistent with
   previous Board standards for accuracy.
                  Therefore, staff recommends that the
16
17
    request to correct the base year and reporting years be
   approved and the biennial review findings be accepted.
18
                  That concludes my presentation and I'm
19
   available to answer any questions. Also, representatives
20
21
   from the City of Auburn are present to answer any other
22
   questions you may have.
```

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.

Staff conducted a biennial review of the

```
1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I want to move
```

- 2 adoption of Resolution 1999-598, consideration of staff
- 3 recommendation to correct the base year reporting and
- 4 reporting year for the previously approved Source
- 5 Reduction and Recycling Element, consideration of biennial
- 6 review findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling
- 7 Element for the City of Auburn.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Second.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Hometown favorite
- 10 Mr. Jones moves --
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I actually had the
- 12 garbage --
- 13 (Laughter)
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- and Mr. Pennington
- 15 seconds that Resolution 1999-598 be approved.
- Without objection, we'll substitute the
- 17 previous roll call. Hearing no objection, so shall be
- 18 ordered.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, just so
- 21 you know, the Mayor Kathy Zans, George Williams was here
- 22 before, Becky Cyren and their local assistance folks are
- 23 sitting back in the audience. We appreciate you coming
- 24 all the way down here.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Item Number 3.

- 1 MR. POGUE: Once again, I'm Kyle Poque with
- 2 the Office of Local Assistance. Please bear with me as I
- 3 do this again.
- 4 Agenda Item Number 3 is consideration of
- 5 staff recommendation to correct the base year and
- 6 reporting years for the previously approved Source
- 7 Reduction and Recycling Element; and consideration of the
- 8 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
- 9 Recycling Element for the unincorporated area of Placer
- 10 County, hereon referenced as Placer unincorporated.
- 11 Staff conducted a biennial review of the
- 12 Placer unincorporated Source Reduction and Recycling
- 13 Element in accordance with the process brought up in the
- 14 October 1997 Board-approved biennial review process.
- 15 Placer unincorporated is successfully implementing a large
- 16 majority of its Source Reduction and Recycling Element
- 17 selected programs.
- 18 Additionally, staff reviewed Placer
- 19 unincorporated's request to correct the base year disposal
- 20 amount and 1995 and 1996 reporting year disposal amounts.
- 21 With these corrections, Placer unincorporated's diversion
- 22 rates exceed the 1959 diversion goal.
- 23 Board staff has determined that the method
- 24 used to calculate the revised diversion rates has been
- 25 adequately documented and is consistent with previous

```
1 board standards for accuracy.
```

- 2 Therefore, staff recommends that the
- 3 request to correct the base year and reporting years be
- 4 approved and the biennial review findings be accepted.
- 5 That concludes my presentation, and I'm
- 6 available for any questions you may have. Thanks.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, as a new
- 9 resident of Placer County, you might want to make this
- 10 motion.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Not there yet.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: All right.
- 13 Mr. Chairman, I'll move adoption -- you know,
- 14 Mr. Pennington is giving me a bad time saying I know those
- 15 were your numbers, but actually they included sewer sludge
- 16 and then some weight issues.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I wouldn't touch
- 18 that --
- 19 (Laughter)
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Let me ask you a question.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Yes, sir.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: Do these numbers include
- 23 the potential growth of Penryn which now seems to be a
- 24 topic of some controversy in Placer County?
- 25 (Laughter)

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: And do they allow for that
- 3 kind of growth?
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I have no idea.
- 5 I want to move adoption of Resolution
- 6 1999-604 to correct the base year and to approve the
- 7 biennial review findings for unincorporated Placer County.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Second.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones moves and
- 10 Mr. Pennington seconds that we adopt Resolution 1999-604.
- 11 Without objection, substitute the previous
- 12 roll call. Hearing no objection, so shall be ordered.
- 13 Thank you, Mr. Jones. Item Number 4, the
- 14 last in Local Assistance and Planning Compliance for
- 15 today's agenda.
- MR. SCHIAVO: And Eric Bissinger will be
- 17 making that presentation.
- MR. BISSINGER: Good afternoon, Board
- 19 Members and Chairman Eaton. My name is Eric Bissinger
- 20 with the Office of Local Assistance, and I'm presenting
- 21 agenda Item Number 4.
- This item considers adopting a compliance
- 23 order to the City of Chowchilla in relation to the
- 24 biennial review of the City's Household Hazardous Waste
- 25 Element. Upon review of the '95 and '96 annual reports,

- 1 the City identified that no household hazardous waste
- 2 programs were implemented during these reporting years.
- 3 Staff contacted and urged the City to confirm that indeed
- 4 household hazardous waste programs were not implemented
- 5 during these years. Given telephone and written responses
- 6 from Chowchilla, staff could not confirm program
- 7 implementation. Therefore, staff was unable to determine
- 8 if the City had made a good faith effort in implementing
- 9 the Household Hazardous Waste Element.
- 10 As recently as late Friday afternoon,
- 11 November 12th, the City of Chowchilla faxed me information
- 12 that suggested the City did participate in a countywide
- 13 household hazardous waste collection event during
- 14 reporting year 1996. Staff has just received the
- 15 documentation that addresses this claim, yet I have not
- 16 reviewed the information and I'm still unable to determine
- 17 compliance.
- 18 This concludes my presentation, and a city
- 19 representative of Chowchilla is here to answer questions.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of staff
- 21 before we get to Mr. William Skinner from the City of
- 22 Chowchilla? Okay.
- 23 Mr. Skinner.
- MR. SKINNER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
- 25 and Board Members. My name is William Skinner

- 1 representing the City of Chowchilla in Madera County. The
- 2 City appreciates this opportunity being provided by the
- 3 Board to present evidence in opposition to the compliance
- 4 order being considered today for the City.
- 5 The City and its residents have implemented
- 6 many waste reduction programs in the past several years.
- 7 We have assessed the causes for the situation we find
- 8 ourselves in today and apologize to the Board for taking
- 9 up unnecessary and valuable time. We have found ourselves
- 10 particularly inexperienced in completing the reporting
- 11 forms and unfamiliar with the process that has led to this
- 12 misunderstanding which we're here today to correct.
- 13 As a point of reference, Chowchilla is a
- 14 small city, about 6,500 people, and as such our staff is
- 15 very limited. In the past we have joined with Madera
- 16 County and the City of Madera in implementing the HHWE and
- 17 the SRRE. We relied on the County to provide these
- 18 resources and reporting.
- 19 The core of the misunderstanding is that we
- 20 did not correctly fill out the boxes, and again it was a
- 21 staff error, first time doing it. Rather, we relied on
- 22 Madera County in the previous years, particularly pre-'95,
- 23 '96 and '97, and we found that even though the County had
- 24 done some reporting, the City itself was responsible for
- 25 adequately reporting on those years.

```
1 After receiving notice from the Board of
```

- 2 the compliance order being considered today, we went back
- 3 and documented Madera County's efforts that in fact
- 4 Chowchilla's residents had participated in implementation
- 5 of the HHWE programs for the years '95 and '96. As
- 6 Mr. Bissinger had indicated, earlier this afternoon we did
- 7 present him with a complete package of those findings.
- 8 The City participated in a countywide event held in 1996,
- 9 particularly July 27th, I believe, and that was advertised
- 10 in the Chowchilla newspaper on four separate occasions.
- 11 According to Madera County Environmental Health
- 12 documentation, at least 12 Chowchilla residents
- 13 participated in that single-day event.
- 14 Recently, the City has worked very
- 15 diligently to develop a used motor oil recycling program
- 16 jointly with Madera County and the City of Madera, and
- 17 that we're also applying for grant funds to provide
- 18 collection facilities through merchants and auto
- 19 dealerships within the city limits.
- 20 Overall we're not pleased with the
- 21 performance of Madera County in implementing the programs
- 22 on a countywide basis. Both the Cities of Madera and
- 23 Chowchilla have been very critical of the County's
- 24 implementation efforts as well as their reporting program.
- 25 The County has reinforced its commitment to deal with a

- 1 contractor to fully implement the programs for which they
- 2 were retained. Furthermore, both the Cities of Madera and
- 3 Chowchilla have indicated to the County that if they do
- 4 not start pulling their line correctly, that Chowchilla
- 5 and Madera will take over these programs themselves for
- 6 implementation.
- 7 Again, what the City of Chowchilla is here
- 8 to respectfully request of the Board is the following and
- 9 that it be allowed to correct the reporting errors made by
- 10 staff -- again, since this was our first time doing it in
- 11 a biennial report -- and that we can probably have that to
- 12 Mr. Bissinger or to the Board within the next week or so,
- 13 a correct biennial report.
- 14 Lastly, both the City of Madera and
- 15 Chowchilla have agreed to jointly monitor the County's
- 16 attention to carrying out the programs of the HHWE
- 17 reporting and we will ensure through a city council
- 18 resolution that these erroneous errors and reporting will
- 19 not occur again so we'll not have to take up the Board's
- 20 valuable time.
- 21 In closing we would like to thank the Board
- 22 for their consideration in allowing the City to correct
- 23 these errors and also for Mr. Bissinger's assistance in
- 24 helping us detail these things out.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you, Mr. Skinner.

- 1 Staff, a response in terms of -- you haven't had a chance
- 2 to look at the information.
- 3 MR. BISSINGER: From what I've seen, I just
- 4 glanced at it. I did see the newspaper articles and there
- 5 was a sheet that indicated that 12 residents did
- 6 participate in the countywide collection event.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: May I ask Mr. Skinner
- 10 a question?
- 11 MR. SKINNER: Yes, sir.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Who does the
- 13 collection of waste in the City of Coachella?
- MR. SKINNER: In Chowchilla, sir?
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Chowchilla.
- MR. SKINNER: Until recently, Madera County
- 17 Environmental Health has a contractor. I believe it's
- 18 Americlean Environmental Services.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: No, I mean the
- 20 garbage.
- 21 MR. SKINNER: Oh, the garbage, sir. It's
- 22 done by Madera Disposal under a private contract with the
- 23 City.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: One of the big reasons
- 25 that you do household hazardous waste programs is to keep

```
that material out of garbage trucks --
 2
                  MR. SKINNER: Very true.
 3
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- keep them out of
 4
    landfills, and I think that sometimes -- what can't be
    lost in this discussion, it's not that there were 12
    people that showed up at a household hazardous waste
 7
    event, but if the Madera County or City of Chowchilla
    isn't informing customers, clients, citizens of the need
    to manage that material right so it stays out of the
    garbage truck, which if it doesn't go through a MRF, which
    I think in Madera does, it could end up in a landfill that
11
    ends up polluting a waterway that ends up messing up all
    your folks.
13
14
                  MR. SKINNER: Absolutely correct.
15
                   BOARD MEMBER JONES: So I think there's a
    need here to work through these issues more than just, you
17
    know, do we have the newspaper articles, did we do this,
    and did we do that, and if nothing else, to use you as a
18
    vehicle to make sure that Madera County understands the
19
    environmental -- the reason that these laws were put
21
    together were to keep that material out of the landfill
    and make sure people understood what they had to do with
23 that material. And I don't want to go too long because
24 I'm hoping we can get through most of this agenda today,
25 but this is a very important thing to me.
```

```
1
                   When I give speeches on this stuff, I'll
    tell you the example I use. A resident threw two types of
 2
    materials, chemicals, into the garbage, and a friend of
    mine ended up losing all the meat on his leg from his knee
 5
    down to his ankle because people didn't know how to manage
    their household hazardous waste.
 7
                   To just say look it was paperwork error I
    think is probably accurate, but I think we need to take
    the time to determine whether or not the programs in
    Madera County and the City of Chowchilla are really
    adequate to protect you, the citizens, and everybody else.
11
12
                   MR. SKINNER: And I whole heartedly agree
    with you, sir, and I think we at the City of Chowchilla
14
    are going to send a very clear, lucent message to the
    County that we're going to take this on ourselves.
                   As part of the granting of the 1996-'97
16
17
    fiscal year, this City received a large metal building
    which is going to be installed on a concrete foundation, I
18
    believe, within the next two to three months. The City
19
    will -- and I guarantee you -- implement the household
21
    hazardous waste implementation programs. If we cannot
    rely on the County, then the City is going to toe the line
   themselves completely, and we will advertise and get it in
23
    our local newspaper and work with Mr. Youngclaus at Madera
25 Disposal to ensure that every resident in Chowchilla, all
```

- 1 6,500 of them, are well aware of the dangers and how to
- 2 dispose of those items correctly.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The compliance orders
- 4 have taken on a new -- I always viewed a compliance order
- 5 as a way to work through something, you know, a time
- 6 certain, bring something back once it's fixed. It is not
- 7 the scarlett "C" that some characterize it.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: That would be "S" I think.
- 9 (Laughter)
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: You know, I would like
- 11 to be able to take the time through a compliance order to
- 12 work through what really makes sense, you know, to make
- 13 sure that we have a program. Plus I have to stay
- 14 consistent. I've never been one before. I figure this
- 15 law has been around long enough. We need to formalize our
- 16 discussions, but I'll defer to my fellow Board Members to
- 17 see what they want to do.
- 18 But I think that the time it would take to
- 19 work this out is minimal, and then you're off a compliance
- 20 order as soon as it's put in place. I look at it as a
- 21 real smart mechanism to finalize things, and I think it
- 22 also gives you some leverage with Madera County to say the
- 23 Waste Board put us on a compliance order to work through
- 24 these things because they don't know that we've got right
- 25 programs in place. I think it could be a real tool.

```
1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Is that a motion,
2 Mr. Jones?
```

- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Actually, it is a
- 4 motion to adopt Resolution 1999-600, consideration of the
- 5 recommendation for a compliance order relative to the
- 6 biennial review findings for the City of Chowchilla.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Mr. Jones
- 9 moves and Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt
- 10 Resolution 1999-600.
- 11 Without objection, substitute the previous
- 12 roll call. Hearing no objection, so shall be ordered.
- 13 Thank you, Mr. Schiavo. I guess we'll be
- 14 seeing you tomorrow and the next day, all day. Wednesday.
- Members and members of the audience, it's
- 16 about five after 4:00. What I'm going to recommend, and
- 17 hopefully you'll agree, that we complete Item Number 13 --
- 18 Item Number 14 is going to be tomorrow because it involves
- 19 the Downey area that Senator Roberti had asked to be put
- 20 over -- and then finish 15, 16 and 17 and call it a day.
- 21 That should get us out of here in a relatively short time.
- 22 You know that if we have a time certain, we've learned
- 23 from past mistakes and Mr. Pennington's admonition that we
- 24 should never do that because it never works out, and he's
- 25 absolutely right.

- 1 So let's move to Item Number 13, and then
- 2 hopefully we'll be able to complete 15, 16 and 17 and
- 3 break for the day.
- 4 Ms. Nauman.
- 5 MS. NAUMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Once
- 6 again for the record, Julie Nauman, Deputy Director for
- 7 the Permitting and Enforcement Division. This item will
- 8 be presented by Tadese and also indicate that Paul
- 9 Manasjan from the LEA is here to assist with any
- 10 questions.
- 11 MR. GEBREHAWARIAT: Good afternoon. For
- 12 the record, my name is Tadese Gebrehawariat. I'm with the
- 13 Permitting and Inspection Branch.
- 14 Item 13 regards the consideration of a
- 15 revised Solid Waste Facility Permit for EDCO Recovery and
- 16 Transfer Station in San Diego County. As I start, I'm
- 17 also happy to report that with us, as Ms. Nauman
- 18 mentioned, is Paul Manasjan, Program Manager for the City
- 19 of San Diego Local Enforcement Agency, and also Mr. Steve
- 20 South, the Chief Operating Officer for EDCO Disposal
- 21 Corporation, the owner and operator of this facility.
- $22\,\,$ Both are here to address any questions that the Board
- 23 Members may have.
- 24 The project allows the following changes:
- 25 An expansion of the overall permitted area of the

- 1 facility; an increase in the overall area of the material
- 2 recovery and transfer station building; the proposed
- 3 permit is also to allow an expansion of the hours of
- 4 operation at the facility; also an increase in the maximum
- 5 number of vehicles on a daily basis at the facility; also
- an increase in the permitted maximum daily tonnage of the
- 7 site from 200 tons per day to 750 tons per day including
- 8 this municipal and other putrescible solid wastes; the
- 9 proposed permit is also to allow acceptance of self-hauled
- 10 waste for the first time; and also to change the name of
- 11 the facility from EDCO Transfer Station to EDCO Recovery
- 12 and Transfer Station.
- As we presented in the table on page 13-3
- 14 of the agenda item, at the time this item was prepared,
- 15 Board staff had determined that most of the requirements
- 16 for the proposed permit were met. Among others, the
- 17 requirements for the California Environmental Quality Act
- 18 or CEQA for the project were complied with. On the basis
- 19 of a pre-permit inspection by Board staff, the facility
- 20 was found to be in compliance and consistent with the
- 21 applicable state standards.
- 22 However, at the time the item was prepared,
- 23 staff of the Board's Office of Local Assistance had yet to
- 24 complete the review and analysis of the project's
- 25 consistency with the City of San Diego's Land Disposal

- 1 Facility Element or NDFE. Since then, the staff did
- 2 complete their review and found the proposed project for
- 3 the EDCO Recovery and Transfer Station is in conformance
- 4 with the City's amended NDFE.
- 5 Therefore, on the basis of the presented
- 6 findings, staff recommend that the Board adopt Solid Waste
- 7 Facility Permit Decision Number 1999-587, concurring with
- 8 the issuance of Solid Waste Facility Permit Number
- 9 37-AA-0105.
- 10 Thank you. This concludes staff's
- 11 presentation.
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of staff or
- 13 any of the representatives who are here from the
- 14 respective entities?
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'll move
- 18 adoption of Resolution 1999-587 with the appropriate
- 19 findings to indicate that the Board has found the proposed
- 20 permit to be consistent with the California Environmental
- 21 Quality Act, in conformance with the intent of the County
- 22 Integrated Waste Management Plan, meeting all local and
- 23 state permit requirements, consistent with state minimum
- 24 standards, and therefore concur in the proposed permit.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I second.

```
1
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Mr. Pennington
 2 moves, Mr. Jones seconds that we adopt Resolution 1999-587
 3 with all the appropriate findings as set forth in the
   record.
 5
                  Madam Secretary, since we haven't had a
 6 roll call, would you please call the roll.
 7
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
 8
 9
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
10
                  BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
11
12
                 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
13
                 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
14
                 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
15
                 Item Number 15.
                  BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Excuse me.
16
17
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: I'm sorry.
18
                  Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
                  BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Chair,
19
20 I just wanted to mention we had had several questions come
   up in our briefings and our meetings about noticing, and I
22 think staff had suggested that we schedule a formal Board
23 discussion sometime at a future Board meeting about
24 environmental review and permit noticing, and that would
25 be very helpful to me, and I believe Senator Roberti, and
```

- 1 I just wanted to put that on the record, that I would like
- 2 to see that happen at some point.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay.
- 4 MS. TOBIAS: Mr. Chair, can I comment on
- 5 that? I think if the Board wants to do an agenda item on
- 6 that, that would be fine. This question did come up.
- 7 Legal office was asked by staff what about this noticing
- ${\tt 8}\,\,$ issue, and I do think that without any change in statutes
- 9 or regs, that we could basically give the LEAs some
- 10 information on how to better get the public involved,
- 11 particularly on sensitive projects, early on in the
- 12 process.
- But I think what's really important is that
- 14 it really needs to be early on in the CEQA process, not so
- 15 much in the permit process. It's important to be involved
- 16 in the permit process, but that's really not where a lot
- 17 of the project is really scoped. And so one of the things
- 18 that we suggested doing was basically send out a letter to
- 19 the LEAs basically talking about how they might get the
- 20 public involved at the early part of the process, even if
- 21 it's a Negative Declaration, and even more importantly
- 22 when it's a Negative Declaration since that doesn't have
- 23 the normal notice of preparation.
- So if the Board wants to hear an agenda
- 25 item, that would be great, but I think the other way we

```
1 could do this is to basically start with that and see
```

- 2 where it goes from there. It's just a suggestion.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I think
- 4 it's a fine suggestion, and I think the objective, at
- 5 least from me, and I believe other Board Members, is just
- 6 to know that people were let know of their ability to
- 7 participate in the project at an early date. So that
- 8 would be fine with me.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Go ahead, Mr. Jones.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, I like
- 12 the idea by my fellow Board Member to have an item because
- 13 I think it's important to have an item so we understand
- 14 the role of the local planning commission, the LEA, how an
- 15 LEA Prepares an item, sets it in motion locally, does -- I
- 16 think that we need to have that discussion so people
- 17 understand that in fact these are local issues that need
- 18 to be done locally; and that if there are shortcomings,
- 19 you know, if there are shortcomings, then that's fine.
- 20 Let us know that in an agenda item.
- 21 But I certainly think that we -- I don't
- 22 want -- I personally don't want to see a letter from us to
- 23 the LEAs explaining how to get the public involved because
- 24 having permitted quite a few facilities, I will tell you
- 25 that the public -- I haven't come across one yet that the

- 1 public hasn't been informed of, and if they're not doing
- 2 their job in preparing the item and we end up saying as a
- 3 matter of fact, one of the reasons that we don't have to
- 4 concur with a permit is that a local agency did not do
- 5 CEQA; right? And we take over.
- 6 So I think that discussion makes sense so
- 7 we understand the role of Mr. Manasjan and the role of the
- 8 operator and the role of the planning department in all of
- 9 those meetings, because I think that it would really be
- 10 information -- I think it would have a great deal of
- 11 benefit for this Board and the audience to see the 27
- 12 meetings that occurred before this item ever got to this
- 13 Board or the reams of discussion items. So I definitely
- 14 would like to see that item Broad forward and give
- 15 everybody an understanding because if some of them need a
- 16 little kick in the pants, then we're capable of kicking
- 17 them in the pants. I don't have a problem with that
- 18 because the public does have a right to know.
- 19 As the industry seat, you can be sure that
- 20 when somebody in my industry does not want to let public
- 21 know, then I'll be the one that makes the motion not to
- 22 concur because that is not the way the game is played.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right.
- Ms. Moulton-Patterson, I just had a brief
- 25 conversation. Why don't we say February, I think is what

- 1 you thought would be a good time to bring back an agenda
- 2 item with regard to not only noticing requirements, but
- 3 perhaps a larger discussion on CEQA and some of the other
- 4 interplay that we would have both from an informational
- 5 purpose, not only as a Board, but also any kind of actions
- 6 that you may have come up against and some of the other
- 7 issues with CEQA, and set it for the February Board
- 8 meeting, which I believe the schedule is now out
- 9 Ms. Covington.
- 10 MS. COVINGTON-WEBB: Yes, it is.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: So you can do that, and
- 12 that will push us past the holidays and some of the other
- 13 stuff that will be hanging around in January. If that
- 14 meets with the Board's direction, so shall be the
- 15 direction.
- We did complete Permit 1999-587, I believe,
- 17 so the next issue is Item Number 15, Z-Best Compost
- 18 Facility in Santa Clara.
- MS. NAUMAN: Thank you. Julie Nauman,
- 20 Mr. Chairman and Members. This is consideration of a new
- 21 Solid Waste Facility Permit for Z-Best Compost Facility in
- 22 Santa Clara. Jon Whitehill of Permitting and Enforcement
- 23 staff will be making the presentation.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Before we begin, if
- 25 there's any other issues that Board Members want to put

```
1 into that category of noticing requirements as they come
```

- 2 through, Ms. Nauman, at some point if you would kind of --
- MS. NAUMAN: Mr. Chairman, I was going
- 4 to --
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Meet with the Board
- 6 Members or whatever and kind of get some ideas.
- 7 MS. NAUMAN: I was going to suggest --
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: That would be helpful to
- 9 us so we get what we're looking for.
- 10 MS. NAUMAN: We've been planning for
- 11 sometime to bring you another item on hold in the process
- 12 including Board staff's involvement with the LEAs.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you.
- MR. WHITEHILL: Good afternoon. My name is
- 15 Jon Whitehill with the Board's Permitting and Inspection
- 16 Branch.
- 17 This item is for consideration of a new
- 18 Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Z-Best Compost
- 19 Facility. This site is located in an unincorporated area
- 20 of southern Santa Clara County near the junction of
- 21 Highway 25 and Highway 101 on agricultural lands five
- 22 miles southeast of the City of Gilroy.
- The Board concurred in issuance of the
- 24 Standardized Green Material Compost Permit on August 27th,
- 25 1997. The operator is proposing the following changes in

- 1 design and operation which require the site to obtain a
- 2 full Solid Waste Facility Permit.
- 3 The 1997 standardized permit allows the
- 4 facility to accept green material. The proposed full
- 5 permit would also allow post-consumer food waste,
- 6 dewatered "grease flakes", wall board for use as an
- 7 additive, and inert construction and demolition wastes for
- 8 use as compost pad construction material. A new building
- 9 will be used for food waste and drywall processing.
- The 1997 standardized permit allows the use
- 11 of elongated windrows for composting. The proposed full
- 12 permit will allow compressed windrows and in-vessel
- 13 forced-air bags. In addition to compost operations, the
- 14 facility will produce mulch and provide top soil blending.
- The permitted volume is 500,000 cubic yards
- 16 of material on-site at any one time and this will not
- 17 change. However, the permitted daily tonnage will
- 18 increase from 500 tons per day with occasional peak loads
- 19 of 2,500 tons per day.
- 20 In summary, LEA and Board staff have made
- 21 the following findings: The facility is identified in the
- 22 Non-disposal Facility Element of the approved Integrated
- 23 Waste Management Plan. However, the description of the
- 24 daily tonnage does not match the daily tonnage described
- 25 in the proposed permit. Also, the State and LEA joint

- 1 inspection documented one violation of state minimum
- 2 standards, and that record keeping violation has since
- 3 been corrected.
- 4 Also, we have received two letters from
- 5 concerned individuals stating that they don't believe that
- 6 the forced-air bag meets the Board's pathogen reduction
- 7 standards. However, we believe that the LEA has addressed
- 8 these concerns through their authority to approve
- 9 alternate pathogen reduction methods.
- 10 Also, the LEA and Board staff have
- 11 determined that the report of compost site information is
- 12 complete. LEA and Board staff have determined that the
- 13 proposed permit is consistent with and supported by the
- 14 1997 and 1999 mitigated Negative Declarations, and the
- 15 permit is consistent with the standards adopted by the
- 16 Board.
- 17 In conclusion, staff has reviewed the
- 18 proposed permit and supporting documentation and found
- 19 them to be acceptable. Staff recommend that the Board
- 20 adopt Resolution Number 99-589, concurring in issuance of
- 21 Solid Waste Facility Permit Number 43-AA-0015.
- 22 Chris Rummel representing the LEA is
- 23 sitting to my left, and also the operator is here.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of staff,
- 25 the operator or the LEA?

1

```
CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
 2
 3
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: I would like to move
 4
   adoption of Resolution 1999-589, consideration of a new
 5
   Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Z-Best Compost
   Facility in Santa Clara, with the appropriate findings to
7 indicate that the Board has found the proposed permit to
 8 be consistent with the California Environmental Quality
9 Act, in conformance with the attempt of the County
10 Integrated Waste Management Plan, and meeting all local
   and state permit requirements, and consistent with state
11
12 minimum standards, and therefore concurs in the proposed
13 permit.
                 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Second.
14
15
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Mr. Jones
16 moves and Mr. Pennington seconds that we adopt Resolution
17 1999-589 with all the requisite findings.
                  Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
18
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
19
20
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
21
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
22
                  BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
23
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
24
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
                  BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
25
```

BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- Okay. Item Number 16. Ms. Nauman.
- MS. NAUMAN: Mr. Chairman, this item is
- 4 consideration of allocation of fiscal year 1999-2000 Solid
- 5 Waste Disposal and Codisposal Site Cleanup Program Funds.
- 6 This program has been referred to as the AB 2136 program.
- 7 This is the annual allocation.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: But because it involves
- 9 money, it can't go on the consent calendar.
- 10 MS. ROUGE: Good afternoon, Chairman Eaton
- 11 and Board Members. My name is Marge Rouge from the
- 12 Permitting and Enforcement Division.
- 13 Item 16 is the request for allocation of
- 14 this fiscal year's AB 2136 Solid Waste Cleanup Program
- 15 funds. As you know, the budget allocates \$5 million to
- 16 this program. After the \$300,000 is set aside for
- 17 administration of the program, there is \$4.7 million left
- 18 to allocate.
- 19 Staff requests that construction contracts
- 20 IWM-C8031 A and B each be augmented with \$1,730,000, and
- 21 additionally staff requests that the engineering services
- 22 contract be augmented with \$1,240,000. These three
- 23 augmentations total \$4.7 million. With these
- 24 augmentations, the programs can continue to clean up
- 25 illegal disposal sites and remediate environmental

```
1\,\, problems at old dump sites.
```

- 2 Staff recommends approval of Resolution
- 3 1999-592. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to
- 4 answer them.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of staff?
- 6 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I will move
- 9 adoption of Resolution 1999-592.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll second.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington moves and
- 12 Mr. Jones seconds that we adopt Resolution 1999-592
- 13 relating to the allocation of fiscal year 1999-2000 AB
- 14 2136 Cleanup Programs.
- 15 Madam secretary, please call the roll.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 20 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 22 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Marge, you must think I'm

```
1 really in a jovial mood.
 2
                   (Laughter)
 3
                  MS. ROUGE: Yes.
 4
                  (Laughter)
 5
                   BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
 7
                  BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just real briefly.
                   I relayed this to Marge at our briefing, at
 8
   my briefing last week, but when you and I were down in San
    Luis Obispo and went to the Cold Canyon Landfill,
   Mr. Gwinn from Gwinn Construction went out of his way to
11
12 identify Todd Thalhamer and Wes Mindermann as doing their
13 utmost to save this Board money and do a hell of a job,
14 also made a comment about how he enjoyed working with
15 Marge and that whole staff. And I figured I might as well
    share that with all of you since I brutalize them from
    time to time. I figure I'll give them the comments when
    it's deserved and needed, and I think you guys are doing a
    good job and I wanted you to hear it before a full Board.
20
                   CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you, Mr. Jones, and
21
    we'll just include that as part of your Member report.
22
                   Last item of the day for today will be Item
    Number 17, consideration of new sites for the Farm and
23
   Ranch Solid Waste Cleanup and Abatement Program.
25
                  MS. TURNER: Good afternoon. My name is
```

- 1 Georgianne Turner of the Remediation, Closure and
- 2 Technical Assistance Branch.
- 3 We have received one application for the
- 4 second quarter of the fiscal year 1999 year 2000, the Farm
- 5 and Ranch Grant Program. This grant would be requesting
- 6 \$10,000 with the County contributing an additional \$6,000
- 7 to clean up putrescible waste at a site that has been a
- 8 problem for the County for quite a while. It would also
- 9 secure that site and provide signs to discourage dumping
- 10 in the future.
- 11 So with that in mind and the fact that the
- 12 application meets all the eligibility requirements, I
- 13 would like to recommend the Board adopt Resolution
- 14 1999-593, authorizing the award of up to \$10,000 for the
- 15 Farm and Ranch Solid Waste Cleanup Program to Mendocino
- 16 County.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'll move
- 20 adoption of Resolution 1999-593 to award \$10,000 to
- 21 Mendocino County for the cleanup and abatement of a site
- 22 under the Farm and Ranch Solid Waste Cleanup and Abatement
- 23 Program.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Mr. Pennington

```
1 moves and Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt
```

- 2 Resolution 1999-593 regarding the allocation --
- 3 consideration of new sites for the Farm and Ranch Solid
- 4 Waste Cleanup and Abatement Program.
- 5 Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- 6 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 10 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- I don't have any slips from the public for
- 15 the public comment period. So with that, we will stand
- 16 adjourned until 9:30 in the morning.
- 17 Members, although it looks like a small
- 18 number of items for tomorrow, there are a couple of large
- 19 items that we know may invoke some controversy. So if you
- 20 can be here promptly at 9:30 and we can get started, it
- 21 would be greatly appreciated.
- I also remind you that we will have a
- 23 closed session tomorrow, hopefully before we break for
- 24 lunch, to go over at least one item and possibly another
- 25 item on Wednesday.

```
So with that, we stand adjourned.
1
2
                 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
 3
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
 4
                  BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I would like to
5 ask you what your count of Qtips was. I have a pile here
6 that I'm supposed to count.
7
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: I used them, so I have a
8 false count. My guess is oh, probably 17.
9
                 (Laughter)
10
                  CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. We stand
11 adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning.
12
                  Thank you.
                            * * *
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

| 1 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, Terri L. Emery, CSR 11598, a Certified |
| 5 | Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California, do |
| 6 | hereby certify: |
| 7 | That the foregoing proceedings were taken |
| 8 | down by me in shorthand at the time and place named |
| 9 | therein and was thereafter transcribed under my |
| 10 | supervision; that this transcript contains a full, true |
| 11 | and correct record of the proceedings which took place at |
| 12 | the time and place set forth in the caption hereto. |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | I further certify that I have no interest |
| 16 | in the event of the action. |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | EXECUTED this 12th day of December, 1999. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | Terri L. Emery |
| 25 | |